

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1334074



Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

From the library of
LLOYD E. SMITH

8
48
157
888

THE CHURCH IDENTIFIED

11

BY A REFERENCE TO

THE HISTORY

OF ITS

ORIGIN, PERPETUATION AND EXTENSION

INTO

THE UNITED STATES.

A NEW REVISED EDITION.

BY THE

REV. W. D. WILSON, D.D., LL.D., L.H.D.,

111

PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY, AND
DEAN OF ST. ANDREW'S DIVINITY SCHOOL,
SYRACUSE, NEW YORK.

NEW YORK:

JAMES POTT & CO., PUBLISHERS,

14 AND 16 ASTOR PLACE.

1888.

The Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

COPYRIGHT, 1888,
BY JAMES POTT & Co.

LC —

PREFACE.

IT is now very nearly forty years since the first draft of this book was given to the public. Since that time quite a number of editions, or issues, have been sent forth, and still the book is in demand—though it has been out of print for several years.

In preparing this edition for the press, the recollection of the time and scene when the first idea of the work occurred, has been constantly in my mind. It was a pleasant day in September, 1848, in the modest parsonage of my quiet little parish in Sherburne. Several students, who were in pursuit of theological training, had sought me out there. Among them were, H. B. Whipple, now Bishop of Minnesota; Os-

THEOLOGY LIBRARY

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

AT CLAREMONT

A4796

good E. Herrick, now Chaplain at Fortress Monroe ; James A. Robinson, an honored Presbyter in Central New York, and the Rev. Theodore M. Bishop, D.D., now gone to his rest and his reward among the saints of God.

We had been talking of one or more of the occasional sermons that were so abundant at that time, which urged the claims of the Church on the ground of the divine institution of Episcopacy—the necessity for the Apostolic Succession, and such like topics. I arose from my chair, and walking the room, said, it seems to me that these men are all mistaking the proper course. What they advocate is well enough, but they are insisting on one or another of the Notes of the Church ; whereas, what we want is the Church identified—and discriminated from among the varying sects around us—the Church itself, and not any one or all of its Notes.

Bishop Whipple, having just come into the Church from among the Congregationalists, grasped the idea

at once, and it was decided that I should proceed to develop it in some articles in the *Churchman*, which was then edited by the Rev. Dr. Samuel Seabury.

I suppose that every one who has any earnest belief in Christ, sees and feels the necessity of belonging to *some* Church, and, doubtless, he feels that it is better to belong to that Church which our Lord founded, if he can only find what it is, and where it is, than to any other. I suppose that most people would be willing to sacrifice a good deal of what they may happen to prefer as a matter of taste, or of judgment even, for the sake of the certainty that they were in that communion and fellowship which he founded, and which he declared "should last forever—the gates of hell should not prevail against it."

In the early days of the Church, in the times which we read of in the New Testament, there was no difficulty in identifying that Church. Hence the severity of the terms in which not only divisions *in* it, but secessions *from* it, and the getting up of rival communi-

ties outside of it, to draw men into that which is not the fellowship of Christ, are spoken of.

But in these latter days the case is widely different. No one can identify the Church among the many bodies or denominations that present their claims, by any minute comparison of them in detail, with the description given in the New Testament. In fact, there seems to most persons to be a singular and most unaccountable absence of any minute description or detail of the Church organization of those days. And yet we read that there is one Body, that is the Church, as well as one Faith and one Baptism; and what deepens the impression of the reader of the Scriptures in regard to this subject is, the fact that there are not only exhortations and entreaties to preserve the unity of the Body, but also statements of the nature and danger of the divisions that might arise, and warnings of the peril of those who allow themselves to be led into these evils. Heresy and schism are classed among the works of the flesh, in the exhortations to a holy life, by the writers of the New Testament.

I have said very little by way of describing or defending the special features of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. There may be some things in it that are wrong; and doubtless there are many that may be improved. But the fact of constant experience shows that many things which, to those who are outside of it appear objectionable, are seen in quite a different light when once they have been fully admitted to its communion.

Since the body of this book was in type I have received the following: "One of the oldest of our Bishops says that within the last thirty years over twelve hundred ordained preachers from the denominations around us have been received into our Ministry. During the last year, thirty have been reported: from the Methodists eight, Congregationalists four, Baptists four, Reformed Episcopalians two, Presbyterians three, Universalists one, not indicated four."

There are but few, if any, who do not at times at least, feel the need of spiritual counsel and guidance,

as well as the fellowship and sympathy of kindred spirits. And, doubtless, all things that are needed for the soul's health and welfare, are to be found in the Church, if we can only find the Church itself. God help us to find it, and to find in its communion and fellowship that peace of mind and help of the Spirit which we all need.

May these considerations prevail more and more, until we all come in the unity of the Faith, the bond of peace, and righteousness of life, to the fullness of the stature of perfect men in Christ Jesus our Lord.

SYRACUSE, *March*, 1888.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION	17
--------------------	----

CHAPTER II.

THE METHOD STATED AND ILLUSTRATED.....	31
--	----

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION	58
---	----

CHAPTER IV.

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND	96
----------------------------------	----

CHAPTER V.

SECTS SINCE THE REFORMATION.....	128
----------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND SINCE THE REFORMATION,	177
--	-----

CHAPTER VII.

THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.....	208
--------------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER VIII.

THE IDENTITY OF SPIRIT	255
------------------------------	-----

CHAPTER IX.

THE EFFECTS OF SECTARIANISM	292
-----------------------------------	-----

THE CHURCH IDENTIFIED.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

THE account of the cure of the woman with a fatal and foul disease of long standing, by our Lord, by the mere "touch of the hem of his garment," is one of the most interesting and tender of all the narratives in the Holy Scriptures. It is recorded by all three of the evangelists that profess to give a historical account of the words and deeds of his life, St. Matthew, St. Mark and St. Luke.¹ And the two of them, who most probably were not present when the miracle was performed—St. Mark and St. Luke,—have taken pains to give prominence to a fact that is not mentioned by the others, namely: that our Lord himself did not know of the cure until after it had been effected.

This poor girl had spent all the money she had, on physicians; she had tried all the natural means, and was "nothing better, but rather grew worse." She

¹ Matt. ix, 24; Mark v, 24; Luke viii, 44.

had heard of our Lord ; and this shy, believing woman thought within herself, that if she could but “touch the hem of his garment, she should be made whole.” We may even suppose that she was unwilling, in her humility, to so much as give him the trouble to but “speak the word,” that she might be healed.

And, doubtless, such has been the experience of many more. Mere faith in him has a transforming power over the souls of them that believe. Somehow or other, no one can really believe in him without experiencing a power from on high, that elevates the soul. This poor girl had, doubtless, done all that she knew, or had the means of knowing, to be necessary to her cure. She believed, and touched the hem of his garment, and “virtue went out of him,” out of his very nature, to heal and to save. And such, it would seem, is the case with the thousands, who, in their ignorance of what our Lord has required of them that would be saved. They have done what they could, and are healed.

But such is not the case with us. We have the Scriptures in our hands, and are able to read them. Faith in Christ, as our Lord and Saviour, produces love to his person. And faith and love will surely produce the most earnest desire of obedience to his blessed will. I say nothing now of the fact of obedience, I speak rather of the spirit and disposition to obey, in all things, his will, so far as that is, or may be made, known to us, as being necessary as a means and condition of forgiveness and salvation. I speak

of obedience only as a necessary outgrowth and accompaniment of faith and love; and, surely, love and obedience, or rather the disposition to obey, are the necessary outcome and fruit of faith. They are, perhaps, the only means that we can have for practically distinguishing between a living faith and a "dead faith," which is of no value.

If, then, we turn to the Bible, we read in our Lord's own words of the requirement of baptism. "He that believeth and is *baptized*, shall be saved."¹ "But he that believeth not shall be damned." If one is baptized and does not believe, there is no hope. But the language, I think, leaves ground to hope that if a believer has not been able to get baptism, *through no fault of his own*, he may expect the Lord's favor and acceptance none the less.

I am not speaking of Baptism, however, as a means of salvation, or with reference to its efficacy on the soul of the recipient; but only of its observance or reception *as an act of obedience*, and a manifestation of love for our Lord, who ordained it.

If we look now to the other sacrament, the Lord's Supper, we need not, for our present purpose, inquire into its nature or efficiency *as a sacrament or means of grace*. Let us look at its observance only as an act of obedience, and as showing the spirit of love and gratitude. He said: "Do this in remembrance of me."² He does not say how often he would have us to do it, nor at what hour in the day. But we cannot doubt, from the reason assigned—the two reasons in fact,—

¹ Mark xvi, 16.

² Luke xxii, 19.

one as a means of spiritual life, as food is to the body; and the other, that by so doing we "show forth his death until his coming again," that he would have us do it more than once in our lives, and, in fact, rather often. Hence, as an act of love and obedience, we cannot neglect or omit this Holy Sacrament altogether, so long as the opportunity and the means of celebrating it are allowed us.

Once more. We find that our Lord ordained and sent forth a Ministry "to preach the gospel to all nations,"¹ "to every creature," and promised to be with them always "even unto the end of the world."² Of course, this language implies their perpetuity as a body of preachers; for, assuredly, no one of them, nor all of them, personally, was able to preach to every creature in all the nations of the earth; nor were they to remain, personally, until "the end of the world." Hence, we find them ordaining deacons³ and appointing others to take part in, and carry on, their work of preaching the gospel, and administering the sacraments at an early stage of their ministry.

Our Lord surely attached great importance to this mission. He does not seem to have contemplated any other way of making his message of love and salvation known to men. He also said, "He that receiveth you receiveth me."⁴

I say nothing here of the nature of the ministerial office and of the importance of the reception of that ministry which he appointed, except the fact that all

¹ Matt. xxviii, 19; Mark xvi, 15.

² Acts vi.

³ Matt. xxviii, 20.

⁴ Matt. x, 40; Luke x, 48.

religious bodies and organizations find it necessary to have some persons set apart for that work—the work of the ministry. Suppose we admit or maintain that one of our own appointing is just as good, and can do the work as well, as the one he appointed. I want the reader to consider the reception of the one which he appointed, in such a way that it must continue “to the end of the world”; and with which he promised to be always, every day or daily, as an act of love, and as a manifestation of the spirit of obedience, which grows out of a living faith and a genuine love to him who instituted that ministry. Of course, his words preclude the possibility of the doubt that the ministry will continue; and continue, too, in such a way and form that every true and loving believer can find it, accept it and the ministration of the word and sacraments at their hands. He has assured us that this ministry shall not fail, or cease to exist, and to be *his* ministry. And he has nowhere given us authority or permission to set it aside and establish one of our own, or to get along as best we can without any.

Doubtless our Lord founded a Church which is to last forever. When Peter had made a comparison of his divine nature, as the Son of God, he said: “On this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.”¹

I know that there are those who claim that this, and most of the other passages in Holy Scripture that seem to speak of the importance of the Church, refer only to the invisible Church, including all who are

¹ Matt. xvi, 18.

spiritually regenerate and holy in their lives and conversation.

I do not propose here to dispute or discuss that; but I wish merely to call attention to the fact that our Lord did attach the utmost importance to a public and outward "confession before men."¹ Baptism is a *visible* act, and has always been connected with a confession or profession of the faith. It is, in fact, a confession or profession in and by itself. It is baptism *into*,—not *in*, merely, but *into*,—the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. St. Paul speaks of the Jews as having been "baptized into Moses";² that is, made or declared to be, believers in Moses, and obedient to his laws; so we are baptized into Christ.

The reception of the holy Eucharist is also a visible and, in some sense, a public act. It was intended to be a "showing forth" of the Lord's death, for our redemption, to the end of the world. But this it could not be, if it were not public. So, too, the ministry are a visible body of men, distinguishable, in some way, from other men, by those who wish to find them and receive the word and sacraments from their hands, or our Lord's avowed purpose has failed; and there is no possibility of our being reckoned among those who receive him by receiving them,³ whatever we may say or think of being included among those who will be rejected by him, because of our rejection of them.

I have spoken of obedience as an outgrowth of

¹ Matt. x, 32; Luke xii, 8.

² 1 Cor. x, 2.

³ Matt. x, 32; Luke xii, 8.

faith and love, and as a manifestation of them both. But I cannot close this part of my subject without a few words more, of a somewhat more earnest character.

I think that no one can have read the New Testament without observing how the subject of obedience is spoken of. The expression "obedient to the faith," and "obedience to the faith," occurs more than once in very important connections. It would seem that, in one point of view, the leading object of the incarnation, and the death on Calvary, was to bring men back to a state of obedience to the will of God. Doubtless, forgiveness and reconciliation are necessary; and the death of Christ was, in some way,—we may not be able to say what way,—but was in some way necessary to the forgiveness and reconciliation; and these are, both of them—if they are to be considered as separable—to the state of submission and obedience which seems to be one—if not *the* one—essential conditions to the glory and happiness of heaven. Hence we pray, "Thy kingdom come, and thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." These words indicate the perfection of loving obedience, as that which constitutes the glory and the blessedness of heaven.

Our Lord makes this doctrine very emphatic, when, in the sermon on the mount, after warning people to "beware of false prophets," he adds, "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that *doeth* the will of my Father who is in heaven." Doubtless this is limited

by the means and opportunities they may have had to learn and know his will,—it is limited to those that “hear and do it not.” But with the Bible in our hands, we can hardly hope to avail ourselves of the excuse that arises from unavoidable ignorance.

Even under the old dispensation, where so much of the worship consisted of rites and ceremonies, the Lord could say, as to Saul: “Behold, to obey is *better than* sacrifice, and to hearken, than the fat of rams.”¹ We may even suppose that the rites and ceremonies themselves, had this, among other important objects, for their existence and observance, namely: to test and promote obedience to the divine will, until that will shall be “done on earth as it is in heaven.”

Nor ought we to omit to mention the fact, in this connection, that both heresy and schism are in more than one place² mentioned as sins which subject us to the disapprobation of God. St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, in regard to some evils that had sprung up in their Church, says, though apparently very reluctant to believe anything so bad concerning them: “I hear that there are divisions among you, and I partly believe it; for there must be also heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you.”³

But heresies and schisms, causing “divisions,” could come only in the visible Church.

Heresy is the holding and insisting upon, or persisting in, an opinion which is contrary to the established

¹ 1 Sam. xv, 22.

² Gal. v, 20; 2 Peter ii, 1; Titus iii, 10.

³ 1 Cor. xi, 18, 19.

doctrine of the Church. And, of course, since a particular Church may err, even if the whole Church cannot, by its unanimous voice, declare anything that is wrong to be "of the faith," and thus necessary to be held by all its members, it follows that one may be in the right even when holding what "they call heresy." Our Lord himself came, as he said, "not to destroy, but to fulfill the law and the prophets;" and yet, by putting an interpretation upon their teachings, which was contrary to the prevailing and received opinion of the Jewish authorities of his time, he was, in their estimation, a heretic. So St. Paul says of himself: "After the way which they—the Jews—call heresy, so worship I the God of my fathers,"¹ though claiming to believe, and as we now judge—actually and truly believing—"all things that were written in the law and the prophets" concerning Christ.

So, too, with schism. It cannot be anything else than a division in the *visible* Church. A division in what is invisible is inconceivable; or, at least, if not inconceivable, it is of such a nature that it is not observable, and never could be seen or known of men.

At any rate, the schisms spoken of with disapprobation, in the New Testament, were divisions in the *visible* Church, and that, too, in the Church in some one city or nation, and not the mere alienations that may have occurred between two or more of the separate Churches that were located and organized in different cities or nations of the earth. St. Paul compares such a Church to the human body, and its members to the

¹ Acts xxiv, 14.

various parts of the body, and insists that eyes, or feet, hands, or other members, should work in harmony and accord with one another, in order that there should be no schism in the body.¹

As with heresy, so with schism, wherever there is either the one or the other, there is a fault on the part of somebody. And it may not be always easy to determine which party is at fault.

St. Paul gives us an insight into the nature and origin of such strifes, in his first epistle to the Corinthians.² He does not lay the blame on any one of the parties named. But the fault was, that some said that they "were of Paul," others, that they were "of Apollos"; and there was not only "division" but also "strife" and rivalry among them,—between the two parties.

But our Lord and his apostles, although regarded as heretics by the authorities of the Jewish Church, were never schismatics. It was the custom of our Lord to worship in their synagogues, and on one occasion at least, he officiated in them.³ He participated as a layman—he was not of the line of the priesthood in that dispensation—in the temple services. He was in Jerusalem for that purpose, in fact, when he was betrayed and crucified.

So, too, the apostles appear to have gone into the synagogues, as the proper place both to worship and to preach, wherever there was one in the town or city which they reached, in the fulfillment of their mission. And we read of the believers at Jerusalem, that they

¹ 1 Cor. xii, 25.

² iii, 3.

³ Luke iv, 16.

not only continued in the fellowship, "the breaking of bread," and the prayers with the "Christians," but also "*in the temple*," with one accord, with gladness and singleness of heart.¹ And this continued at Jerusalem until they were cast out, and the temple itself destroyed by that avenging messenger of God, Titus and the Roman army.

Nay, so far from causing a schism or separating from the established order, our Lord expressly commanded his disciples—"they sit in Moses's seat, all therefore whatsoever they teach you observe, that observe and do," notwithstanding their great errors which he severely reprobated.

I do not mean to assert or insinuate that the rites and customs were the same in all "the churches." There was a *one Church*, holy and catholic throughout the whole world; and there were also national or provincial churches, in the different provinces or nationalities into which the populations of the world were divided. Each one of these churches was complete in itself, and independent of each other, as we shall see more fully by and by. There was one faith that was common to them all and essential to their being of the "one body." So, too, there were certain rites and customs that were common to them all, as Baptism and the Holy Supper. But we infer from the writings of St. Paul, that diversities, at least in certain less important elements of the religion and worship, were in existence and freely allowed, even in his day. He says, in writing to the Corinthians: "We have no

¹ Acts ii, 46.

such custom, neither the churches of God.”¹ From this the inference seems to be obvious and inevitable, that there were different customs in the different churches or branches of the Church, which were allowable, as they might be conducive to edification; while others were not allowable, and were not in use anywhere. This liberty can, of course, apply only to those matters of detail in regard to which our Lord has given us no commandment, and which the Apostles do not appear to have taught or instituted as of divine command.

I have no disposition to diminish, or underestimate, in the slightest degree, the value of whatever excuses any one may have for his or her ignorance of what is the will of God, in regard to the Church; and I think God is more generous and loving in this respect than he has seen fit to make known to us in his revealed Word. But there can be no excuse, I think, for a want of *the spirit and disposition* to obey in all things so far as God shall give us the means and opportunity to know what are his will and pleasure in this, as in other matters. But for all cases, and to any extent of unavoidable ignorance or mistake, we may take to our comfort the case of the woman who believed, and felt sure, in the strength of her faith, that if she could but “touch the hem of his garment,” she should be made whole.

But the fact remains that our Lord did appoint and send forth his ministry to teach his word, and to guide those into the way of truth who might be willing to be

¹ Cor. xi, 13.

guided by them. And he established his Church, into which they should gather, by Baptism, those that should be, or might be, in the process of "being saved";¹ for that seems to be the obvious and natural meaning of the expression. I refer to the Greek, which any scholar will see means as I have interpreted it. And the revised version so reads it: "And the Lord added to them [to the Church], day by day, those that were being saved." And in this view I see no escape from the conclusion that the Church, in what it is, and what it includes, is, as a collective whole, the divinely appointed way and means of salvation. And this is in accordance with what St. Paul says: "All things are of God, who has reconciled us unto himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given unto us the ministry of reconciliation."² He continues the idea: "Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us. We, then, as workers together with him, beseech you also that ye receive not this grace in vain." In the first epistle c. iii, 9, the apostle has said, "We are laborers together with God, ye are God's husbandry, ye are God's building."

Of course, this can not have been said of St. Paul and his fellow-laborers in respect to their special character as inspired men. The work of which he speaks is as necessary now as it was then, and will be no less so to the end of the world. And the ministry, thus appointed to do that work, must be perpetuated and continued, or we must invent and institute one of our own as best we can. "The field is the world," and there will be need of men for "the work of the minis-

¹ Acts ii, 47.

² 2 Cor. v, 18.

try " even when all the kingdoms and peoples of the world shall have been converted to Christ and gathered into his kingdom. Even in that case, always, even "unto the end of the world " there will be need of some persons to baptize the infants that shall be born, to administer the Lord's Supper to those who by this means wish to "show forth," in gratitude and love, "his death, until he comes again "; to lead in the public worship, and to guide and counsel those who are in doubt, and feel the need of an instruction and a guidance superior to their own.

St. Paul intimates quite clearly the continuance of the ministry, when he says, that it is "for the perfecting the saints, for *the work of the ministry*, for the edifying of the Body of Christ till we all come in the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."¹ Surely, then, "the work of the ministry " is to be done, and will need to be done, till the end of earthly time. Again, St. Paul, writing to the Thessalonians,² exhorts them in these emphatic words: "And we beseech you, brethren, to know," or recognize, "them that labor among you and are over you, in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love for their work's sake, and be at peace among yourselves." Most assuredly, these words cannot apply to the apostles and other inspired ministers, whose office was to pass away with the age in which they were appointed. Our only inference, therefore, is that they were to continue, in their corporate capacity, to the end of time.

¹ iv, 12, 13.

² v, 12, 13.

CHAPTER II.

THE METHOD STATED AND ILLUSTRATED.

IN the days of the apostles there could have been no difficulty in identifying the church in which the duties of the Christian life could be performed and the privileges and blessings of grace and fellowship could be enjoyed. The apostles had been appointed by our Lord himself. They had been taught by him in person, and they had been empowered to work miracles in his name and as an evidence of their commission and authority.

But when they passed away the case became somewhat different. False prophets and teachers arose, as he had foretold to draw multitudes after them.¹ No one of them, however, so far as I know, ever attempted to form a new church by making converts of their own, independent and outside of the One Church that Christ in person and through his apostles had founded. What those false apostles aimed to do was to get themselves recognized as teachers *in the Church*, to build up a sect or a schism in its communion. And they aimed or preached "to draw away followers

¹1 Matt. vii, 15 ; xxvi, 11, 24 ; Mark xiii, 22.

after them " only when they had been repudiated and ejected by a church itself acting through its recognized and competent authorities. St. Paul and St. John each of them speak of such cases.¹

However, such secessions, all of them, came to naught at a very early day. None of them remained long to trouble any one who sought to identify the Church, in order to enter the communion and fellowship of that which was truly the body of Christ.

At a somewhat later day the question becomes more serious. It arose, however somewhat incidentally and as a question that was at that time subordinate to another.

Our Lord sent his apostles to *preach* the gospel, and nothing is left on record as having been said by him about their *writing* it. They did, however, commit it to writing, and these writings were received as of divine authority, read in their churches, and used as means of instruction in their schools — for the Church early had schools for the instruction of its members — as well as for private edification. Collections of these writings were made and added to the Old Testament canon. Heretics also appealed to them as authority for their doctrines and even went so far as to forge spurious writings which they attributed to the apostles and for which they claimed recognition. This led to the necessity for some test; and this test was an appeal to those Churches which had been founded by the apostles and their immediate and well known successors in the work of extending the Church. The books

¹ Acts xx, 30 ; 1 John ii, 18, 19.

that they had received were true and genuine. The doctrines that they have handed down and constantly believed and proclaimed were to be regarded as expressing the true sense of Holy Scripture in all points; in regard to which there was uniformity and agreement; and that, in every case, was to be regarded in each nation or province, as the true Church, which retained the ministry in its succession, the Holy Scriptures in their integrity and continued the close observance of the two great sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. All these Churches had a "form of words" or a creed—which was essentially the same in all its doctrines and is the same in nearly the exact words and phraseology as what we now have as the Apostles' Creed. But the test was apostolic origin, and the continuity of the ministry. This implied and included the other essentials as they were regarded, namely, the reception of the Holy Scriptures and the continued use of the creeds, and the observance of the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper.

The two most *obvious* elements of Christianity and of the Church, are (1) the Scriptures and (2) the two sacraments first named. But then the gospel cannot be "preached" as our Lord intended and commanded it should be, nor the sacrament be administered without the ministry. Hence *the* ministry, continued by some means of valid perpetuation, became an essential element of the Church which he instituted. And the creeds of the primitive Church while it was whole and undivided, must be accepted by each branch of the Church or "the body" will not recognize it—there

will be a schism in the body—and the part thus cut off is likely, not to say absolutely, certain to die, as a limb amputated from the body, or a branch cut off from the one vine; for they would not only have “denied the faith” but they would be most assuredly “cast out” from the fellowship of that body of which the Holy Spirit is the life and life-giving energy.

It is easy to see in the early history of the Church how, that is in what state of mind, and not only from what antecedent influence each heresy arose, but, also, how God used it as he did the treachery of Judas and the weakness of Pontius Pilate, as means to the accomplishment of his most beneficent ends. The founders of sects stirred up the true believers to consider most carefully the doctrines they should teach, and the forms of expression they should use, and the rites and modes of ritual and worship that would be most safe and conducive to the edification of the faithful. Hence we have not only the canons of the early Church, but the creeds and determinations of Nicca, Constantinople and the other general councils, which all the Churches of those early days set forth all its parts and branches, sooner or later most reverently received.

And I cannot doubt that something of the kind may now, or in due course of time, be said of all the modern sects and divisions. They grow out of the past, they were favored and brought to light and manifest outward existence by the peculiar mental habits of their founders and members, and they will, in the end, be found to conduce to the increase of the number of those that shall be saved to the glory of God, the ex-

tension of and building up of the Redeemer's kingdom. Each of them has attractions for, and adaptation to a certain class of minds that could not, perhaps, be reached otherwise, and though they "follow not with us," we must remember our Lord's saying "no man that can work a miracle," that is, do any mighty work, "*in his name* can lightly speak evil of him."

In order to identify the Church, it is obvious that we may take one of two different methods. We may ascertain from the Scriptures what are to be regarded as its essential Notes, and then institute a comparison between those notes, or features, and any given body claiming, at this day, to be the Church, or a branch of it. Or we may go back to the first planting of the Church, and trace its existence down the current of time, in its spread over the face of the earth, until we find it extending itself into our own country. The former method is the most common in our day—and has involved us in interminable discussions upon the preliminary matters—Episcopacy, Presbyterianism, Congregationalism, etc., which are merely Notes of the Church, and thus kept us back from the subject itself; and even when the question has been decided, it leaves the appearance of making the whole matter depend upon a question of mere form.

I shall take the last of the two methods indicated above. This would be very easy if the infirmities, the follies, and the willfulness of men had not encumbered the subject with embarrassments which render a more cautious procedure and a more careful investigation necessary.

Let us, then, endeavor to get a definite idea of the Identity of the Church. And for this purpose, perhaps a few illustrations from other subjects will be of the most important service.

There is, for instance, such an institution as *Masonry*. I say nothing of its merits, or demerits, but simply refer to its existence as an illustration in point. It has existed, through several centuries at least, one and the same institution. It is spread extensively over the face of the earth. It is the same institution in all the nations where it has an existence at all. In separate towns and villages there are distinct Lodges, each with its officers, its Lodge-room, etc. He that joins any one of these Lodges is a Mason, there and everywhere. In any other Lodge, in any other nation, he would be received as a free and accepted Mason, to the same standing and degree as that which he had at the place where he resided. This is because of the *identity* of the institution. It is one and the same everywhere.

If, now, several individuals, in a settlement where there is no Lodge, believing the institution to be a good one, become desirous of joining the Masons, and having a Lodge where they reside, there are certain rules and principles of extension by which they can obtain their object. They must first go in sufficient numbers and be regularly initiated into some Lodge already in existence; and having been initiated themselves, they may obtain a charter or dispensation, and go to work under it. In this way they become truly Masons — their association is a Lodge. They derive all the benefits, whatever they may be, of this ancient

institution, from their connection with the Lodge which they have founded. And they are Masons the world over. In any Lodge, in any city or nation, they would be received to the same standing, and entitled to the same privileges.

But if they had gone to work otherwise than as these principles of extension require, or got up a clandestine lodge, they would not have become Masons — their association would not have been recognized as a Lodge at all — nor would they themselves have received any of the benefits which would result to them from being Masons — for, in fact, the course which they took did not make them Masons, but only imitators of Masons.

The same illustration may be derived from the Odd Fellows' institution — from that of the Sons of Temperance — the Rechabites, etc.

As this is an important point, I will venture one or two more illustrations ; and especially so because each individual will understand it the better if I give as an illustration something that he has known in his experience or that has occurred to his own thoughts.

Take, then, for another illustration, the American Bible Society ; an association which, while it is chiefly designed for doing good to others, confers benefits and privileges upon its members. This society was, I believe, first established in New York. It has a written constitution, established modes of operation, and established principles or provisions for extension by means of auxiliary associations, which may be formed in every county, town, or parish. If individuals, re-

siding in a place where there is no auxiliary society, are desirous of establishing one, they have only to ascertain what are the rules that are laid down by the parent society, and strictly conforming themselves to those rules in their organization, they become thereby members of the American Bible Society. They are entitled to all the benefits arising from such membership, and can do all the good which it enables them to accomplish.

But if they proceed otherwise than according to those established rules, they may indeed form themselves into *a* Bible Society — one that may confer benefits upon its members, and enable them to do good by the circulation of the Bible — but still they will not be members of *the American Bible Society*, nor will their association be one that is auxiliary to, or a part of, that older and more extensive institution.

Now this same thing must hold true with regard to the Church. Our blessed Redeemer contemplated founding a Church, that should exist forever.¹ But it is evident that he did not himself establish it in all places. Neither was it established in all places and nations by his immediate apostles, during their lifetime. There must, therefore, be certain principles on which its extension depends, and by which it may be extended; so that where a number of persons, who are already Christians, or who are desirous of becoming so, are found, a society may be formed in accordance with those principles, and become thereby part of his Church.

¹ Matt. xvi, 18.

Every society that is intended to outlast the generation in which it is instituted, and to be extended beyond the immediate locality where it was first organized, must have principles of extension, by which it can be expanded and located elsewhere. By ascertaining these principles we are able to follow the society in its spread, and identify its existence in each particular place. The Church, like a vine, the root of which is at the place of its first establishment — Jerusalem — puts forth its branches into each city, province, and nation, until they spread over the face of the whole earth, and its tendrils reach every human heart. Now a vine is one. Though it may have many branches, yet we find no difficulty in identifying them. We can trace each one back till it articulates with the main stalk, and so, through that stalk, to the original root, in a continuous line of unbroken succession. Or, in case we start with a branch that does not belong to the same vine, we can trace it back to its separate root and tell where it started from, ascertain, perhaps, by whom it was planted. And at any rate, we can thus prove that it is not a branch of the same vine. In tracing the vine, however, we may find here a branch crushed and deformed by violence, there one overlaid by mildew and rust — here one blighted by dearth or choked by the growth of noxious weeds. And then again, we may possibly find one on which man has grafted scions of a different stock so as to produce fruits of a different character. But through all, its identity can be traced; it is the same vine still. So with the Church. Violence has been at work upon

her sacred principles and lineaments; superstition has overlaid her simple truths and simple forms; apathy and worldliness have blighted her fruits, and the invention of man has been busy with efforts to engraft its own multifarious schemes upon that which is the only life-giving stalk. But the Church's historic identity can be traced through them all.

It is comparatively easy to trace the identity of the Church in those places where it was established by the apostles and has continued, without interruption to this day, as at Jerusalem, Antioch and such places. The constant admission of members has kept the visible organization alive. And the constant administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and the observance of Sunday and other holy days, with, in fact, the constant recognition by other branches of the church, and other notes of various kinds, guide us without fear or danger of mistake. And as a matter of fact, though we find the enemy has always been busy at work in creating divisions and schisms, yet, in the places of which we now speak, there has never been any difficulty in deciding which was the old Church, and which the new sect.

There may have been much difference of opinion as to which was right, the old Church or the new one, but none as to the fact, which was the old and which the new. In other words, the identity of the body has never been a matter of doubt or dispute.

In all the earlier controversies — the Aryan, the Donatist, the Pelagian, and the Nestorian — there was no doubt, no question raised that these sects were the

more recent bodies. They, of course, all claimed to be right. But no one of them claimed to be the Church that had existed from Christ and the apostles. Their plea was that the Church had fallen into error and corruption, and that they were reformers. And so they were, if they had truth on their side, so long as they continued in the Church. But when they left it to form a new one, that which they formed *was* a new one, and that which they left *was* the old. So, also, with the modern sects — the Presbyterians, the Independents, and the Methodists — in England. There is no pretence that any one of them is the Church that has existed in England from the earliest ages. It is fully and freely acknowledged that they are new churches, formed by individuals seceding from the old.

Now such facts do not at all embarrass us in our attempts to identify the Church in those countries where it was planted in the earlier ages — that is, in ages so early as that no mere sect that then existed has lasted down to our own. The Church that was planted there, and has outlived all schisms and sects and oppositions, is undoubtedly and unquestionably the one of which we are in pursuit. It may be somewhat — nay, sadly — changed in doctrinal character and general appearance, but, historically and lineally, it is the same.

The difficulty presses upon us only when we come to identify the Church in these latter ages, where sects are abundant, and where, until lately, the name of Christ had not been heard. Though late in reaching us, a branch of the vine may have found (and we trust

it has found) its way to our country. In studying the history of the Church, we shall find that it was never inactive. The vine was always growing, always putting forth new branches. The Northern nations of Europe — Sweden and Norway — were not converted until the tenth or eleventh centuries. Yet at length a branch of the vine reached them also. So with us. Therefore we want some clue, or guide, by which we can trace the connection and identify the body.

Now, to accomplish this object, I propose to ascertain, in the first place, what are the fundamental principles of the extension of the Church, as we find them in the Scriptures, and apply those principles to the facts of history. I propose to inquire, then, how the Church was extended and expanded by the apostles, into other countries than that where it was first established.

The method which I propose to pursue is one with which we are familiar in similar cases. For instance, the Baptist sect was first established, in the United States, at Providence, R. I., A. D., 1639. Since that time it has spread over almost the whole country. Yet we have no difficulty in identifying it. We are willing to go by *the name*, until we learn that there are several sects claiming the same name. We then resort to their principles of extension, and to the acknowledgment of communion. They have principles by which their church can be extended indefinitely. Persons residing in a place where there is no society of that communion, have only to ascertain those principles, organize accordingly, and they are acknowledged by

the general body of the Baptists as a part of their Church.

The same may be said of any other denomination in this country. It has its own principles of extension. When in the formation of new religious societies, designed to belong to any existing communion, the people favoring it have only to conform to the rules and organic principles of that denomination, they become a part of it, and as a religious body are identified with it. But if they do not conform to those principles, they form a new denomination—at first by themselves: but, in the course of time, others may adopt their rules and principles, build on the same platform, and then they will become a vine also, putting forth branches, perhaps, into other parts of the earth. And in writing the history of that denomination, we must first learn, from a study of its principles of extension, what we are to regard as a part of the same denomination and what is not; that is, we must identify it.

Now this is what I propose to do with regard to the Church of Christ—the visible society of believers which he founded. We cannot always be guided by the name; for that is claimed by all sects in one form or another. We must then follow the Vine historically, and trace its progress as it extends itself into different countries and thus identify its existence. And in order to do this, we must, in the first place, ascertain the manner in which, or the principles by which, it was extended.

I have said that this method is one with which we

are already familiar. All denominations use it in their own case, and therefore no one can object to use it here. There is not one of the fifty or sixty denominations of this land that is not extending its communion, or at least seeking to do so, by establishing societies in places where there are none of their order. And when such a society is established, they ascertain, in some way or other, whether it has been established on their own principles, and in conformity to their general usages, before they receive it into their communion. They all have representative bodies, or councils, under the name of Conference, Presbytery, Convention, Association, Convocation, Synod, or something of the kind; and when any newly formed society seeks admission to their deliberations, etc., they examine (if they have not previously been sufficiently assured), and see if the society has been organized in conformity to their principles and usages. If so, they gladly grant the admission which it seeks. But if not, the recognition is withheld. If its members yield their points of difference, they may be united; if not, they form a new sect, and are so regarded.

Whatever, therefore, we may think of *the result* of our application of the organic principles of the Christian Church to the facts of history, we are, all of us, prohibited by our own acts—acts indispensable to our distinct existence—from pronouncing the method unsound or unjust. And in taking this course, it seems to me no small gain that we avoid all of the appearance, as well as the reality, of making Church com-

munion depend upon a mere form, or incidental fact. It carries all along with it the impression that it is not a mere form that we are seeking, but the Church itself—the mystical body of Christ—the fellowship of the Apostles and Martyrs—the communion of those who have been sanctified—the Temple of his Worship—the participation of his promised presence—the Flock that he feeds, and the Fold of his watchful care.

The principles by which the Church was extended over the face of the earth, must be inferred partly from the acts of the Apostles, in extending it, and partly from the precepts and principles scattered through the New Testament, more or less directly applicable to the subject.

The principles that I shall call attention to, are, (1) that the Church must be extended by living members, (2) going into a place where the Church was not previously established, (3) for the purpose of preaching the true Faith, and establishing the Communion of the Church there. Of these principles we will speak in order.

1. The charge or commission which our Saviour gave his Apostles, just as he was leaving the world—“Go ye into all the World, preach the Gospel to every creature, teach or make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you,”¹ raises the presumption that the Church was to be established and extended by persons who had previously been re-

¹ Mark xvi, 15 ; Matt. xxviii, 20.

ceived as members and acknowledged to have authority in it. No question will be raised, I presume, that this commission, and the duties assigned to the Apostles, did at the least include the establishing or extension of the Church which he had before declared that he would build.¹ He did not send the Apostles to preach the Gospel and leave the converts to organize a church or not, as they might choose, and in such a way as they might choose. He did not charge the Apostles to commit the Gospel to writing and leave the people to study it for themselves, and then act as they might think it required. The duties of the new life, to which the converts were called, required some society, association, or organization. The Church was not a mere matter of choice or expediency: it had an end in view: it was a necessary element of his religion. It was for the support of Public Worship; the administration of the Sacraments; the comfort, fellowship and edification of its members. Therefore the Apostles were to establish it, and enlarge its extension as fast and as far as converts should be made to resort to it, and live in its communion.

The thing to which I wish first to direct attention, is, the fact that the Apostles went and did the work of founding and extending the Church themselves.

It is unnecessary to follow them as they went, preaching the Gospel, and ordaining Elders in every Church² where converts to the faith had been made in sufficient numbers to sustain the continued worship of

¹ Matt. xvi, 18.

² Acts xiv, 23.

God. The fact that the living Preacher went first with the Gospel—not in his hand, for it was not then committed to writing, but in his heart—is the conspicuous and the prevailing rule. Nor is this confined to the Twelve; for St. Paul, the chief Apostle of the Gentiles, was soon after converted, and became more efficient than any of the rest, and in no respect a whit behind the very chiefest Apostles.¹ We also find Barnabas, Timothy, Titus, and others, laboring in the same way and sphere, though manifestly in an inferior capacity.

After the persecution that arose at the time of Stephen's martyrdom, Philip, who, as we read, had previously been appointed to some inferior office in the Church,² went down to Samaria and preached the Gospel. And the people gave heed to Philip, hearing and seeing the miracles that he wrought. And when they believed and were converted, they were baptized in large numbers. The Apostles yet abode at Jerusalem; but when they heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent down Peter and John, two of their number, who laid their hands on the newly baptized converts, and they received spiritual gifts.³ These gifts had not before been received by the Samaritan converts.

But again: We read that they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, traveled as far as Phenice, Cyprus and Antioch, preaching the Gospel. Now, who those men were we do not know. We only know that they were

¹ 2 Cor. ii, 5.

² Acts vi, 1-6.

³ Acts viii, 5-7.

not Apostles. But be this as it may, the narrative proceeds to say, that when the tidings of this came to the ears of the Church which was at Jerusalem, they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch, the most distant place from Jerusalem that is mentioned, and so over the whole country spoken of. When he came and saw the grace that had been given them, he exhorted them to cleave unto the Lord. And, as we read, much people was added unto the Lord. Immediately Barnabas went for Saul—or Paul—and brought him to Antioch, and they remained there for a whole year, and “assembled themselves with the Church, and taught much people.”

Hence we see that the Church was extended by individuals previously in its communion—sometimes alone, as in the case of Philip, and sometimes in companies—going into places where they would be as seed scattered in the soil, to spring up and bring forth a harvest, or like leaven hid in a lump until the whole be leavened. Thus, always, each branch and part of the Church had a historic and visible connection with the rest, and that which existed before, and through that Church received the persons who were to do the ministry among them. Wherever the Apostles went, they were men who had been set apart for the Ministry themselves. And in other cases—as Samaria and Antioch—the mother Church sent forth Apostles as soon as they had heard of the conversion of those places; to the one, Peter and John; to the other, Barnabas and Paul.

But in no case do we find a society starting up inde-

pendently of that which existed before, and organizing themselves as "a voluntary association," called or recognized as a part of the Church of Christ; the gathering and organizing energy in all cases proceeded from Christ through the Church itself, to each separate branch and member.

2. The second principle of the extension of the Church seems to be, that, besides perpetuation by additions in places where it already exists, it must be extended by establishing new branches in other places, and not by establishing different branches in the same place.

We might follow the Apostles, as they went from one nation or province to another, laboring for a time in the central places of population and influence, and see how, in every case, this rule was observed. In this way a great number of distinct and independent branches of the Church were established, all having the same faith, the same hope, the same rule of life, and all partaking of the same fellowship, and forming one and the same communion.

In each place the Church had to start anew, and begin from nothing. At first, therefore, it would be but small in point of numbers. They could all be accommodated in one place of meeting and worship, and they would need no more. As they increased in numbers, however, they would need more than one place of worship. Other places were provided. But there were then no divisions into parishes and separate congregations, each with its appropriate minister as at the present day. The divisions into parishes and separate

congregations, each with its appropriate minister, as at the present, came in at a later day.

But with or without the Parochial system, there could be no occasion for forming another church or religious denomination in the same place. With it the Church and communion already established might be extended as fast as occasion should require, or as done by each denomination at the present day, by forming new congregations and organizing new parishes. Without it, all that would be required would be to add to the number of the places of worship and, perhaps, to the number of the clergy, as fast as the increasing wants of the community might require, leaving the members to attend at whichever place they might choose.

The feelings of brotherhood, and brotherly love, which are so strongly inculcated in the Scriptures, and which the religion of Christ is so peculiarly calculated to produce, would dispose all the Christians in any place, to belong to the same society or Church. They would also remember the Lord's prayer that they might all be one, that he might dwell in them and they in him.¹ They would be familiar with such precepts as these: "Let brotherly love continue,"² "Let us walk by the same rule, let us mind the same thing,"³ "Be of the same mind one toward another,"⁴ "Love as brethren,"⁵ "For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, so also is Christ; for by one Spirit are we all baptized

¹ John xvii, 21.

² Heb. xiii, 1.

³ Phil. iii, 16.

⁴ Rom. xii, 16.

⁵ 1 Pet. iii, 8.

into one body.”¹ “There is one Body and one Spirit, even as ye are all called in one hope of your calling, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all,”² “That there may be one Fold and one Shepherd.”³

And, as enforcing these precepts of Divine truth, we are to consider what is said of the nature and danger of divisions; “For ye are yet carnal—for whereas there is among you envying and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men? For while one saith, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollos, are ye not carnal?”⁴ “Mark them that cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them, for they that are such serve not the Lord Jesus Christ.”⁵ “There must also be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest.”⁶

We need go no further to see that all the believers in one place would endeavor to “speak the same thing, that there should be no divisions among them, but that they should be perfectly joined together, in the same mind and in the same judgment.”⁷

And if any one should come preaching “another gospel,” either in the Church that was already established, or for the purpose of establishing another of a different denomination, he must be rejected and avoided. In the strong language of St. Paul, twice repeated, “let him be accursed.”⁸

¹ 1 Cor. xii, 12, 13.

² John x, 16.

³ Rom. xvi, 17, 18.

⁴ Eph. iv, 4, 5.

⁵ 1 Cor. iii, 3.

⁶ 1 Cor. xi, 19.

⁷ 1 Cor. i, 10.

⁸ Gal. i, 8-9.

This must evidently be the meaning of the Apostle. He was not speaking of those who professed to teach a new religion, altogether distinct from and independent of Christianity, but of those who inculcated a view of Christianity inconsistent with the doctrine of Justification by the Faith, which he had taught them. By "another gospel," therefore, he must have meant another view of the same gospel; for he says of it, that it "is not another," but another view, or a perversion, of the same.

There was then no possible way in which another church which should be a distinct visible society, or communion, and yet a true branch of the Church of Christ, could be established, in a place where one already existed, so as to produce two in a community. (1.) It could not be produced by a division, or secession, for that is condemned as carnal, and not serving the Lord Jesus Christ. (2.) It could not be by the coming in among them of false Apostles or Prophets; for no society which they could establish would be any part of the Church of Christ. (3.) It could not be by a person's coming among them to preach another gospel—another view of Christianity—even though that person were an Apostle, or an angel from heaven; for whoever should come on such an errand or undertake such a work, must be held "*accursed*."

Hence, then, we may lay it down as a rule that the Church was expanded or extended, not by establishing different denominations in the same place, but by establishing the same denomination in different places.

3. In the third place, the persons going into an un-

occupied field—purely missionary ground—to establish the Church, must go for the purpose of establishing a branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, on the same basis, and for the same object, as the Church itself. This *basis* is, the Christian Faith, the Christian Sacraments, the Christian Worship, and the Precepts of the Christian Life. And the *object* is, the glory of God in the salvation of sinners. These being essential elements of the Church and of Christianity, they must, of course, therefore, be essential to its Identity.

St. Paul says, “other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid.”¹ This foundation is the Christian Faith, as the Apostles taught it, and the Church at first received it.

I do not mean to say that every error or mistake in point of fact, will nullify or invalidate the labors of the missionary who makes it. Such mistakes are incident to human infirmity, and separable from whatever is to be done by fallible men. But when a missionary, or a band of them, go about to build a church on a basis or foundation materially different from that which was the acknowledged Creed, or Confession of faith of the Primitive Church, the design itself shows that they intend to found a new church—a new religious communion. And such a step would lead to two results, which would make the fact that a new church had been established conspicuous and generally admitted. (I.) The new church would not be likely to claim communion with the old, but would be likely, on the other hand, to entertain some feelings of hostility towards

¹ I Cor. iii, 11.

it. (2.) Nor would the old Church admit the claims of the new one to be received to communion and fellowship, if such claims were made. So that the fact of non-intercommunion—and, perhaps, great hostility—would be a sufficient indication that there was no identity or affiliation between them.

One may err in his apprehension of some of the points of the Primitive Faith. Education may have accustomed him to some modifications of the Primitive rites and customs. But these things, so long as they do not lead him to seek, by a conscious intention, to engraft them upon the Primitive Faith and customs, or so to narrow down the Christian Platform, and restrain the liberty of conscience allowed to Christians by the Law of Liberty in Christ Jesus, that its members are not allowed to hold the Faith in its purity—do not necessarily constitute the church so established, an entirely distinct one. It may teach and practice error—but it does so unintentionally. It was not founded for the purpose of binding over its members to the errors which it inculcates. The door is not closed against the light. It has interposed no obstacles to the return to the truth, in its purity and simplicity; but everywhere professes the design so to teach that truth to its members.

The design of the heresiarch—that is, the person who founds a new sect or church—is, to found one that shall embody and represent his own peculiar views. These views are of course diverse from those entertained by the Church or churches already existing—else there could be no desire to establish a new

one. Now we have seen, under the Principle last specified, that this desire or design can not be indulged in a community where the Church already exists. The operation of the Principle now under discussion, is to prevent this design or desire from taking effect *in any other community*. The result would be no less a new and distinct church in the one case than in the other. The founder lays a new foundation in the doctrines and usages which he advocates, and his followers are built upon that foundation, with himself, perhaps for "the Chief Corner-stone." And his church, instead of being an extension of the Church of Christ, is most evidently another and a new one.

We have now considered the three Principles of Church extension, which encompass the whole subject. I do not profess to have enumerated all the principles involved in the subject—I have selected only those which are the most general in their character—the most obviously true, and the most easily applied to the facts of history. With these principles, we can follow the Church from its establishment at Jerusalem, in the days of the Apostles, to its extension and final triumph in all the remotest corners of the earth. Be it Episcopal or Presbyterian, Baptist or Papal—be its form and its doctrines what they may—the same Principles of Extension will enable us to follow it in its growth, and identify its existence. We need not even know what are its doctrines or its forms—these may all be left as a matter for subsequent investigation. But the Church itself, in any place, and for any country, or any age, we can find and identify

—postponing all secondary and subordinate questions until we are able to contemplate them from a more advantageous position, and settle them more satisfactorily.

I am aware that thus far I have been running counter to the opinion of those who think that the Church exists wherever the Gospel is preached. But evidently the Church and the Faith are not the same thing. The one is a system of doctrines to be believed—the other is a visible society professing to be believers in those doctrines. Now it is obvious, that other persons and societies of persons may take the same standard of Faith as that to which the Church holds. Nay, there are different churches and denominations at the present day, having substantially, if not in form, the same creed, one with another, and yet no one thinks of calling them one and the same body—the same Church.

Let it then be distinctly kept in mind, that we are seeking to identify the Church, and not the Faith.

The Church, then, is susceptible of an identification distinct from that of the Faith. We should identify the Faith by first seeking out the earliest *Creed*, and then follow that creed in its adoption or rejection through the lapse of ages, carefully noting every variation in its language—and in the sense in which it was understood and believed. But in identifying the Church, we start with the idea that the Church is a visible society of men and women, capable of a visible historic existence through successive generations, as they pass over the stage of human action.

And when we have thus outwardly and historically

identified the Church, we may entertain a presumption almost as strong as certainty itself, that we shall find in its teaching "the Faith once delivered unto the Saints." At all events we shall have found the casket in which the jewel was placed,—the keeper and witness to whom the Truth was intrusted, and whose testimony we are bound to take into consideration in all our inquiries after the Truth itself.

CHAPTER III.

THE CHURCH BEFORE THE REFORMATION.

THE full execution of my plan would require me to go over the whole history of the planting and extension of the Church from the day of Pentecost up to the present time, and show the application of the principles laid down in a previous chapter, throughout. But this, as will be seen at once, would require a great deal of detail which would have no direct bearing upon the more immediate practical result to which I design to bring my present undertaking. It will be borne in mind, that while I have laid down the principles by which to identify the Church in general, I am aiming to give to the present discussion of the subject such a shape as to enable one with certainty to identify the Church *here* from amidst so many claiming sects. I shall select my portions of the history of the Church for the application of my principles with this view; leaving out all others as having no immediate connection with the object now before us.

The Apostles, in executing their mission of preaching the Gospel, first settled in the principal towns and cities, establishing a Church in each, which was left to

grow until it should extend the dominion of Christ's Earthly Kingdom over the surrounding country, and meet the efforts of the Church planted in the next city spreading the Gospel in like manner over its surrounding territory. These Churches were at first independent of one another. And if we would follow out the history of their planting, we should find the three Principles already laid down fully and exactly followed.

Of this independence I shall have occasion to say more in subsequent chapters.

It would be well, in some respects, to go through the New Testament in the first place and see how these principles were observed and illustrated by the immediate Apostles of our Lord. But as I must omit something, and the New Testament is in the hands of everybody, I will pass it over. However, the early history of the Church, besides that which is contained in the Acts and Epistles of the Apostles, assigns a different local and limited territory to each of the Apostles, with more or less of certainty in regard to them. In the earlier period there seems to have been a general division of the Field—as between Sts. Peter and Paul; the former going chiefly to the Jews and the latter to the Gentiles. But the traditions with regard to the Apostles are rather uncertain and vague. St. Paul, however, refers to this principle as having been observed by himself. “Yea, so have I strived to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation.”¹

¹ Rom. xv, 20.

It is, indeed, quite true that the Apostles went sometimes in companies of two or even more, as Sts. Paul and Silas and Timothy and Barnabas and Mark.

But in all these cases they were in harmony and worked together. They had but one Gospel to preach and one Body to build up. Even if in some places, as at Antioch, there were two congregations—one composed of converts from the Jewish religion and the other from among the Gentiles,—allowed to remain as somewhat distinct for the time—there was but the one Faith, one Lord, one Baptism; these differences soon disappeared. They were not two churches or two denominations of Christians, for “the wall of partition” had been broken down and the tendency was to bring them into union so soon as the Jewish converts could be gotten over their disposition to observe certain portions of the Law of Moses, which had been declared by the council at Jerusalem to be no longer binding upon them and not obligatory on the Gentile converts at all.

But with this exception in a few large cities, where there were many Jewish people, the church in each city was one, how many soever or Apostles and other ministers may have labored within its borders.

We have several short treatises that were written by the *immediate* disciples of the Apostles, as, Sts. Clement, Ignatius and Polycarp, of whose genuineness there is no doubt. Of these one—Clement—is mentioned, as is believed, by St. Paul (Phil. iv, 3), as one whose name is written in the Book of Life.

Of Clement, we have only one Epistle that is clearly

genuine, and that is to the Corinthians, and is mostly of a practical and hortatory character. He speaks, however (xiv), of those who, "through pride and sedition, have made themselves ringleaders of detestable emulations." But he says (xlii), "the Apostles have preached to us from our Lord Jesus Christ; Jesus Christ from God. Christ, therefore, was sent by God; the Apostles by Christ; so both were orderly sent according to the will of God. For having received the command . . . they went abroad proclaiming that the kingdom of God was at hand. And thus, preaching through countries and cities, they appointed the first fruits of their conversions to be Bishops and Ministers, over such as should afterwards believe, having first proved them by the Spirit." Then, xliv, he says, "So likewise the Apostles knew, by our Lord Jesus Christ, that there should contentions arise upon the account of the Ministry; therefore, having a perfect knowledge of this, they appointed persons, as we before said, and then *how, when they should die, other chosen and appointed men should succeed them in this Ministry.*"

St. Clement died as a martyr, in the persecution under Trajan, about A.D. 100, or possibly a little later. The Epistle was written about A.D. 67 or 70.

The next writer, whose works I will cite, is St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch—that old city on the Orontes,—where the believers were first called Christians. He suffered martyrdom at Rome in A.D. 107. He had been a hearer of St. John, and was, probably, converted by him. It is also said that he was ordained

Bishop of Antioch, by St. Peter, before he went to Rome,—if he ever went there.

On his way to Rome, he wrote seven Epistles: one to the Ephesians, one to Magnesians, one to the Trallians, one to the Romans, one to the Philadelphians, one to the Smyrneans, and one to St. Polycarp, at that time the Bishop of Smyrna.

In his Epistle to the Romans, he makes no mention of their Bishop,—no allusion to “the Chair of St. Peter,” and no mention of St. Peter. But in all the other Epistles, except that to Polycarp, who was himself Bishop, he makes constant mention of the Ministry as existing in the three orders: Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons. In these letters—except that “to the Romans”—although the Martyr makes mention of their Ministry, Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons, yet in no one of them does he allude to any Bishop as being over these Diocesan Bishops, or to any “Bishops of Provinces,” or Archbishops, as they were afterward called. It is most likely, therefore, that at that early period, which was, at the latest, A.D. 116, the Church had not been organized into Provinces; so that each city, with its one Bishop and other clergy—Presbyters—always in the plural, and Deacons—were totally independent of any and all others.

With Ignatius, therefore, the office of a Bishop was a definite and precise thing.

In the epistle to the Ephesians he says (iii): “For our Lord Jesus Christ, our inseparable Life, is sent by the will of the Father as the Bishops *appointed to the utmost bounds of the earth*, are by the will of Jesus Christ.”

In the epistle to the Magnesians (vi) he says: "I exhort you, that ye study to do all things in a divine accord, your Bishop presiding, . . . your Presbyters in the place of the council of Apostles and your Deacons, most dear to me, being entrusted with the ministrations of Jesus Christ." In the epistle to the Trallians (iii) speaking of the three orders, Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons, he says: "Without these there is no Church." To the Philadelphians (iv) he says: "Wherefore let it be your endeavor to partake all of you of the same Holy Eucharist, for there is but one flesh of one Lord Jesus Christ and one cup in the unity of his blood, one Altar; as also there is one Bishop, together with his Presbytery, and the Deacons, my fellow servants, so that whatever ye do, ye may do it according to the will of God." To the Smyrneans he says (viii): "In that ye all follow your Bishop as Jesus Christ followed the Father; and the Presbytery as the Apostles; and reverence the Deacons, as God has commanded."

These extracts are but a small part of what might be cited. But they will suffice for the present purpose, and I think they will be regarded as strong confirmation of my point, namely, that there was but one Church or denomination in one city or community, and that provision had been made by our Lord and his Apostles for establishing such a Church in every city and nation of the Earth.

But instead of following the long detail of the history of their planting, it may be both more satisfactory and more interesting to quote a few passages from the

early Christian writers to show that the principles to which I have called attention, were then substantially regarded in the same light as I have aimed to place them.

Of course it will not be expected that they were then stated in the way that I have stated them; for there was then no occasion for such a statement. The principles were not disputed or denied, and of course needed not to be stated in either an argumentative or didactic way. All that we can expect therefore is to find them recognized or assumed as unquestionably true. The evidence of the regard for these principles would be perhaps the most clearly manifested in such a work as Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*, where he gives an account of the spread and perpetuation of the Church down to his own time, that is, through the first three centuries. In each case we find the historian carefully specifying the facts which show the conformity to these principles: and yet not in a way to imply that there was any dispute or doubt about them; but rather in a way which implies that these were the essential facts, which it was well and important to put distinctly on record.

I will cite, therefore, only a few of the later Fathers, and the first passage that I will quote is from Tertullian, who was converted to Christianity toward the close of the second century. In writing of heretics, or, perhaps I had better say—concerning the rule by which we are to decide who are heretics, he says:

“Immediately, therefore, the Apostles (whom this title intendeth to denote as ‘sent’), having chosen by

lot a twelfth, Matthias, into the room of Judas . . . first having throughout Judea borne witness to the faith in Jesus Christ, and established Churches, next went forth into the world and preached the same doctrine of the same Faith to the nations, and forthwith founded Churches in every city from whence the other Churches thenceforward borrowed the tradition of the Faith [received the Faith] and the seeds of doctrine, and are daily borrowing them, that they may become Churches. . . . Wherefore these Churches, so many and so great, are but that one primitive Church from the Apostles, whence they all spring. Thus all are the primitive, and all are Apostolical, while all are one.”¹

And then in reference to others, he says:

“If there be any heresies [sects] which venture to plant themselves in the midst of the age of the Apostles, that they may therefore be thought to have been handed down from the Apostles, because they existed under the Apostles, we may say, let them then make known the original of their churches: let them unfold the roll of their bishops so coming down in succession from the beginning that their first Bishop had for his ordainer and predecessor some one of the Apostles, or of the Apostolic men, that continued steadfast with the Apostles. For in this manner do the Apostolic Churches reckon their origin: as the Church of Smyrna recounteth that Polycarp was placed there by John; as that of Rome doth, that Clement was in like manner ordained by Peter. Just so can the rest also

¹ Tertullian, *De Praescrip.*, § xx.

show those, whom being appointed by the Apostles to the Episcopate, they have as transmitters of the Apostolic seed. . . . To this test, then, they will be challenged by those Churches, which, although they can bring forward as their founder no one of the Apostles or of Apostolic men (as being of much later date, and, indeed, being founded daily), nevertheless, since they agree in the same Faith, are, by reason of their consanguinity in doctrine, counted not the less Apostolical. So let all heresies, when challenged by our Churches *to both these tests*, [to wit, their origin and their faith] prove themselves Apostolical in whatever way they may think themselves so to be. But in truth they neither are so, nor can they prove themselves to be what they are not, nor are they received into union and communion by Churches, in any way Apostolical, to wit, *because they are in no way Apostolical*, by reason of the sacred mystery which they teach." ¹

The reader will please bear in mind that I am not quoting Tertullian for the sake of expressing my own ideas in another man's language, nor for the sake of approving all that he says. My object is to show that the Principles of church extension which I have laid down, were constantly kept in view and regarded as sacred by the Church generally, before the Reformation. For this purpose I continue my quotations a little farther.

The next author that I shall quote is Cyprian, who also had been a heathen of eminence, before he was converted. He died a Martyr, A.D. 258, Sept. 14.

¹ Tertullian, De Praescrip., § xxxii.

“The Church is likewise one, though she be spread abroad, and multiplies with the increase of her progeny: even as the sun has rays many, yet one light; and the tree boughs many, yet its strength is one seated in the deep-lodged root; and as where many streams flow down from one source, though a multiplicity of waters seem to be diffused from the bountifulness of the overflowing abundance, and unity is preserved in the source itself. Part a ray of the sun from its orb, and its unity forbids the division of light; break a branch from the tree, once broken it can bud no more; cut the stream from its fountain, the remnant will be dried up. Thus the Church flooded with the light of the Lord, puts forth her rays through the whole world, with yet one light, which is spread upon all places, while its unity of body is not infringed. She stretches forth her branches over the universal earth, in the riches of plenty, and pours abroad her beautiful and onward streams, yet is there one head, one source, one Mother abundant in the results of her fruitfulness.”¹

Again, the same author speaking of Novatian, who had tried to get up a new church, says:

“He attempts to make a human church, and sends his new apostles through very many cities that he may establish certain recent foundations of his own institution.” “And does any think that there can be, in one place, either many shepherds or many flocks? The Apostle Paul, likewise imitating the same unity, solemnly exhorts ‘I beseech you, brethren, by the name

¹ Cyprian, *De Unitate*, Oxford Trans. § 4.

of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you; but that ye be joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.' And again he says, 'forbearing one another in love, endeavoring to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.' Think you that any can stand and live who withdraws from the Church and forms himself a new home and a different dwelling?"¹

This brings us to A.D. 325, the first General Council after that of the "Apostles, Elders and Brethren," which met at Jerusalem.—Acts xv.

Before this time, however, the Bishops and Churches had been accustomed to meet and confer with one another in regard to matters of doctrine and discipline. In this way we have a series of Canons, known as the Apostolical Canons. No one knows when or where, or by whom they were formed. But at the Council of Nice—which was held, it will be remembered, within about twelve years after the conversion of Constantine, and as soon, therefore, as any *general* Council could have been held,—these Canons were in existence. And what is more, they were recognized and re enacted for the whole Church, as obligatory upon all of its members. They said, "Let the ancient Canons or customs be maintained." I will cite a few of their provisions, as proving the point that there was then but one church in a city or town, that was recognized as belonging to the Catholic Church,—all the rest were regarded as heretics or schismatics.

¹ Epist. lv, § 20, and De Unitate § 7.

Canon XIV ordains that no Bishop may go beyond his Diocese [or Parish as it was then called] to perform any function except in certain cases, and "this must be done not of his own accord, but by the judgment of many Bishops and at their earnest exhortation." Canon XXXI provides that "if any Presbyter, despising his own Bishop, shall collect a separate Congregation and erect another Altar, . . . let him be deposed for his ambition." Canon XXXIV enacts "the Bishops of any nation must acknowledge him who is first among them and account him as their head, . . . but each one of them may do those things which concern his Diocese (or See) and the the country places which belong to it." And XXXV Canon prohibits a Bishop from ordaining any clergy beyond his own limits, in cities and places not subject to him. The provincial system had now come into use to some extent.

Passing now to the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, we have as Canon IV: "It is most proper that a Bishop should be consecrated by all the Bishops of the provinces, but if this be impossible, . . . at all events three shall meet together to consecrate him. . . . and those who are absent shall give their consent in writing." Canon VI ordains: "Let the ancient customs prevail which are in Egypt and Lybia and Pentopolis. . . . For this is customary to the Bishops of Rome. In like manner at Antioch and *in all the other provinces* the privileges are to be preserved to the Churches." It will be noticed that "the Bishop of Rome" is mentioned and "the customs" of his prov-

inces as one of the many that were recognized were to be preserved. But manifestly he was only one of the many, and had at that time no authority or jurisdiction out of his "own province" which we happen to know was then only the "suburbicarian district," that is, Rome and its suburbs, with, possibly, the Island of Sicily.

I will now quote one or two other Fathers who lived and wrote after the Council of Nice.

St. Chrysostom, A. D. 395, in writing his Homilies on the Epistle to the Galatians, on the expression "*churches of Galatia*," thinks that St. Paul was referring to the sects that had been founded by the preachers of another Gospel. He notices that the Apostle does not call them "*the beloved*" or "*the saints*" nor even "*the churches of God*" but simply "*churches of Galatia*." "Here at the outset, as well as elsewhere, he attacks their irregularities and therefore gives them the name of '*churches*' in order to impress them and to reduce them to unity. For persons split into many parties cannot properly claim the appellation '*church*;' for the name is one of harmony and concord."

This exposition, as will be seen at once, is based upon the idea that there could be only one Church in a place that could "properly claim the name." He seems not to have thought of the possibility of there being more than one in the same community and therefore he gives the explanation which we find above.

Again he says:—

"For this is, if anything, the subversion of the

Church, the being in divisions. This is the Devil's weapon, this turneth all things upside-down. For so long as the body is joined into one, he has no power to get an entrance, but it is from division that the offense cometh."¹ I now quote from Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, A. D. 350:

"While the Kings of particular nations have bounds set to their dominions, the Holy Church Catholic alone extends her illimitable sovereignty over the whole world." "Now it is called" *catholic* "because it is throughout the world, from one end of the earth to the other, and because it teaches, universally and completely, one and all the doctrines which ought to come to men's knowledge, concerning things both visible and invisible, heavenly and earthly; and because it subjugates in order to godliness, every class of men, governors and governed, learned and unlearned; and because it universally treats and heals every sort of sins which are committed by soul or body, and possesses in itself every form of virtue which is named both in deeds and words and in every kind of spiritual gifts. And it is rightly named '*Church*,' because it *calls forth and assembles together* all men."²

The same author says also: "But since the word '*Church*' or '*Assembly*' is applied to different things (as also it is written of the multitude in the theatre of the Ephesians, Acts xix, 41, and since one might properly say that there is a *church of the evil doers*) the Faith [the rule of Faith, or Apostles' Creed] has

¹ Homilies XXXII on Rom. xvi, 17, 18.

² Catechet, Lects., xviii, §§ 27, 23, 24.

delivered to thee, by way of security, the Article, 'and in *One Holy Catholic Church*,' that thou mayest avoid their wretched meetings and ever abide with the Holy Church Catholic in which thou wast born again. And if ever thou art sojourning in any city, inquire not simply where the Lord's House is (for the sects of the profane also make an attempt to call their own dens '*Houses of the Lord*,') nor merely where the church is, but where is the Catholic Church. For this is the peculiar name of this Holy Body, the Mother of us all, which is the Spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Only Begotten Son of God."¹

Here I close my quotations from individual authors, not, however, from want of much more like this, (for I could easily fill a volume), but for want of room, and because I deem it unnecessary to proceed any farther.

I have quoted the Apostolic Canons and those of Nice as bearing on the subject before us. It may be well, however, before going any farther to cite the VIth Canon of Constantinople. The council was a general council of the whole Church, and was held A. D. 381. The Fathers at this council say: "And we include under the name of heretics those who have been formally cast off by the Church, and those who have since been anathematized by us, and in addition to these, those also, who do indeed pretend to confess the sound Faith, but have separated themselves and founded congregations in opposition to our canonical Bishops."

¹ Lects. xviii, § 26.

IN accordance with the Principles already discussed in Chap. II., which as we have now seen, were entertained by the Church universally, the communion of the Church was extended from its first establishment up to the time of the Reformation with a progressive growth from century to century, until it covered the whole of Europe—the Western part of Asia, and the Northeastern part of Africa.

Thus the Church was established in Asia Minor by the Apostles A. D. 40–50. St. Mark, the Evangelist, established it in Egypt. In the fourth century Frumentius was consecrated by St. Athanasius as the first Bishop of Ethiopia. And in the same century the Gospel was preached in Armenia, Iberia, Thrace, Moesia, and Dacia. Two missionaries—Columban and Wilibord—the former from Ireland, and the latter from England, planted the Church to a considerable extent in many parts of Germany—as Batavia, Friesland, Westphalia, and Denmark in the seventh century. In the eighth century Nestorian Missionaries from Chaldea converted the Tartars. In the ninth century the Church made its way into Austria, Sweden, and Russia. In the tenth it became established in Poland, Hungary, and Denmark. Of course it did not reach the Western Continent until the sixteenth century, or afterwards.

Thus we see that the Church was never stationary—but always progressing in its extension. Many of the nations which we have named above were not wholly converted at the time specified, and the work of their conversion continued many years (in some cases more than a century) before it was completed.

The ravages of Mahometanism had obscured and greatly marred a part of the Church, and the strifes between the Bishops of Rome and of Constantinople for the supremacy or precedence, had led to a division or schism. Russia and the east of Europe, including Greece and the west of Asia, and the northeast part of Africa were on the one side, and Europe, from Austria west, was on the other. The former part is usually known as the Greek Church. The latter as the Western or Roman Church.

There is no contemporary evidence that St. Peter was ever at Rome. We know of his having been at Antioch and having participated in building up the Church in that ancient city. It is in fact pretty well established that before the union of the Jewish and Gentile converts, St. Peter labored there with the converts from Judaism as St. Paul did with those that had been converted from the Gentile world, and that the two Apostles united in placing Ignatius—from whose epistles, written on his way to his martyrdom at Rome, we have already made some quotations.

But there is no contemporary evidence that St. Peter ever went to Rome in any capacity; Ignatius never alludes to it. None of the earlier lists of their Bishops ever include his name. St. Jerome, who lived *at the close of the fourth and fifth century*, is the first author of note that gives the name of Peter as among their Bishops. Otherwise and by other and all the earlier authorities, we have the list as follows: Linus, A. D. 79, Clement (whose epistles I have quoted), Anacletus, A. D. 91, and so on.

But in the second and third centuries—that is, one hundred years or more after St. Peter's death, writers began to speak of him as having suffered martyrdom, with St. Paul, at Rome. I certainly do not intend to deny that he did, but the fact that there is no contemporary evidence of the fact, no mention made of it and no allusion to it for some two or three hundred years after the death of St. Peter, shows very clearly that no such importance was attached to the fact of his having been there, as we have in modern times, especially by the advocates of the Romish Supremacy. The notion of the "Chair of St. Peter" as at Rome, and the idea that Peter himself was the Rock—rather than the Faith which he had just confessed—on which the Church was built, came in at a later age. *We know how and when it came*—the "Fathers" conceded "the primacy of honor" to the See of Rome, *because that Rome was the "imperial city."* At the Council of Nice the fathers conceded the second place to Ælia—Jerusalem—while in fact Alexandria was the ecclesiastical head of the Church at that time, and at Constantinople A. D. 381. Constantine having made that city the seat of his empire in the East, the "Fathers" decreed (Canon III) that "the Bishop of Constantinople shall have the primacy or precedence *of honor* after the Bishop of Rome, *because that Constantinople is new Rome:*" the Council of Chalcedon, the largest of the general councils, A. D. 451, with six hundred and thirty Bishops, decided Canon XXVIII, "the Fathers *properly* gave the primacy to the throne of the elder Rome, because that was the imperial city."

The growth of the *Supremacy* of the Bishop of Rome as contrasted with the mere "*Primacy in honor*" which the early councils gave him, was gradual, and will be considered more at length hereafter. But the influence of the city—"the imperial city"—was gradually transferred to the See of the Bishop. I will in this place, however, allude to one of the means of this transfer, which was of a more general character. The Bishops of Rome, besides having their Sees in the imperial city, were generally—though not always—regarded as sound in the faith. Hence, very naturally, appeals would be made to them by Bishops of less important Sees. They would apply to them for their "*opinions*," as anybody in these modern times would ask the opinion of a great and influential man in any department of theology or science—when he might happen to be in doubt, or, as frequently occurred, when he happened to be in controversy with his more immediate superior, the Bishop of the province in which he lived.

As an example: From the time of Constantine, the Emperors in the East were, or professed to be, Christians with one exception—the apostate Julian. But they were statesmen more than Christians, for the most part, and they were disposed to use whatever of Christian influence they could command, whether catholic or sectarian, as they could best use it for purposes of statecraft or kingcraft. But Rome and the Bishop of Rome, for the time being, was too powerful to be ignored. Nay, it was not safe, in a political point of view, to dissent or differ from him in matters of the

faith. Hence Bishops *in the east*, from Antioch, from Edessa, and such places would appeal to the Bishop of the older Rome, as against those that differed from them in the East and even from the Emperor himself, when he happened, as occurred quite too often, to be unsound in the faith. The Bishop of Rome, to say nothing of any ambitious or selfish motives, would, for the sake of his adhesion to the faith of the Church, as declared at Nice, side with the appellant; and with so much influence from his very name (often) and his position (always), that the Emperor seldom dared to disregard it or go in contradiction to the opinion thus declared.

And what thus grew up, naturally, from the position of the Bishops of Rome, and was, at first, merely a matter of our common human nature, came to be "precedents," and were afterwards cited as such in favor of claims to a supremacy in matters of faith and discipline, such as none of the earlier bishops of Rome ever thought of claiming. And thus we see an illustration of the saying, that what is wrong, ought not to be done at all; and what is right, ought to be done as a precedent.

However, the Bishops of Rome, in the rude times that followed, were extending, by one means or another, their influence over the churches of the Western Empire, or rather the western part of the Empire.

The Roman Communion therefore consisted of several national or provincial Churches, which had been brought in some way to acknowledge the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome as Pope. He and they had

arrogantly appropriated to themselves the title of "*Catholic*," and declared obedience and submission to the Pope to be indispensable to God's favor.

Among those Churches which had been brought into this subjugation was the Church of England. Planted in that Island in the days of the Apostles, and probably by an Apostle's own labors—St. Paul—it maintained its perfect freedom from all foreign jurisdiction or interference for four or five centuries—until after the Saxon invasion. The Island was then reconverted in part, by Missionaries, sent thither from Rome, who, of course, brought with them a Roman influence, which, by one means and another, was increased, until the Papal Supremacy was fully acknowledged some five or six hundred years afterwards. Of course, therefore, the Church of England partook of the darkness and corruptions of the middle ages. While the Eastern Churches which had never acknowledged the Papal Supremacy, had not become nearly so corrupt.

At the Reformation then, we have the Church in what, for convenience sake, may be called two communions—the Eastern or Greek, and the Western or Roman—nearly equal in point of numbers—and both equally parts of the original vine, planted in accordance with the Principles to which our attention has been called. They were divided by events that occurred long after they were established, and not by the very fact of their origin. The Reformation—which took place in a part of the Western or Roman part of the Church—constituted still another division,

as we shall soon see ; so that after that event the whole Church Catholic will be distinguished into three parts or communions—the Greek, the Roman, and the Reformed.

It would be unnecessary, so far as the practical result of our present undertaking is concerned, to refer to any of the sects which existed before the Reformation, were it not for the fact, that some of our modern sects refer to them, and especially to the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*, as the link of visible union and connection between themselves and the Primitive Church Catholic. These sects have also served many modern speculators another very convenient turn. After having come to the conclusion that the Churches in the Roman Obedience are apostate, it is necessary to point to something that might be regarded as the continuation of the Church, notwithstanding this apostacy; and, as if forgetting the whole Eastern half of the Church, these writers have fixed upon the Waldenses and Albigenses as answering the demands of their theory. It becomes necessary, therefore, for these two reasons, to give these Sects a passing notice.

1. The *Albigenses* seem to have been a sect who were at first called *Paulicians*, and are said to have been *Manichæans* also in their religious opinions. The Paulicians are a sect “said to have been founded in Armenia [a country in Asiatic Turkey] by two brothers, *Paul* and *John*, the sons of *Callinice*, of Samosata, and said to have received its name from them: some, however, derive it from one *Paul*, an Armenian, who lived in the reign of Justinian II.”¹

¹ Mosheim. Book III. cent. ix., Part II., cap. v., sec. 2.

About the middle of the eighth century, (752. *Cedrenus*). *Constantine*, surnamed *Copronymus*, by the worshipers of images, had made an expedition into Armenia, and found in the cities of Melitene and Theodosiopolis a great number of Paulicians, his kindred heretics. As a favor, or a punishment, he transplanted them from the banks of the Euphrates to *Constantinople* and *Thrace*; and by this emigration their doctrine was introduced and diffused in Europe.”¹

“From *Bulgaria* and *Thrace*, some of this sect, either from zeal to extend their religion, or from weariness of Grecian persecution, removed first into Italy, and then into other countries of Europe; and there they gradually collected numerous congregations, with which the Roman Pontiffs afterwards waged very fierce wars.”² “*Albigesium* was the name given to the whole territory of the Viscount of Albi, Beziers, Carcassone, and Rasez. Hence *Albigenses* became, from this time, the name,—at first for all those who fought against the crusaders, and then—for the *Cathari*,³ or *Puritans*, as they called themselves.”

I will now proceed to give some of their characteristic doctrines: That there are two Gods and Lords, the one good, the other evil; that the creation of all things visible and corporeal was not by God the Father Almighty and the Lord Jesus Christ, but by the Devil and Satan, the evil god, who is the god of this world; that all Sacraments are vain and unprofit-

¹ Gibbon's *Decline and Fall*. Ch. LIV.

² Mosheim. Cent. xi., Part II., cap. v., sec. 2.

³ Gieseler. Text Book of Ecc. Hist. Ed. Philadelphia, 1836. Vol. ii. p. 385, sec. 7.

able. As to the Eucharist, they believe that there is nothing in it but mere bread. They condemned Baptism by water, saying that a man was to be saved by the laying on of hands upon those that believed *them*. They allow of no ministry. They say that marriage is always sinful, and cannot be without sin. They hold that our Lord did not take a real human body, nor real human flesh of our nature; and that he did not really rise with it, nor do other things relating to our salvation. They affirm that the Virgin Mary was not a real woman, "but their church, which is true penitence; and that is the Virgin Mary." They deny the resurrection of the body, and hold that human souls are spirits banished from heaven on account of their sins.¹

I will not go farther into an account of this sect. The "*Facts and Documents*" collected by Maitland, show beyond question that they were, as he says, "either hypocritical imposters or misguided fanatics," or both, aiming at no good for mankind; and so far from being characterized for true piety and zeal against the errors of their times, they were given to sensuality and selfishness.

After what has been said, it will hardly be necessary to add anything more to show that no modern sect can gain anything in point of respectability or ecclesiastical identity with the Church of Christ from an alliance with the Albigenses. We have seen that they were not persons of good standing in the Church in

¹ Abridged from Limborch, in Maitland's *Facts and Documents*, p. 233-241.

the country from which the founders of this sect in Europe came. They went into a country where the Church was fully established, without going into, or seeking to enter, its communion; they set themselves about making converts to their opinions, which were sufficiently abhorrent from the Faith once delivered to the Saints; they neither claimed, nor were acknowledged to be, a part of that identical, visible society which had existed from the days of the Apostles, and was planted by their labors.

2. "The early history of the Waldenses is, indeed, involved in some obscurity; but it seems clear, beyond all reasonable doubt, that they owed their name and their origin as a sect, to a certain citizen of Lyons (in France), who lived in the latter half of the twelfth century [1160]. It appears, also, that he [Peter Waldo] caused the Scriptures to be translated into the vulgar tongue; that he and his immediate followers drew upon themselves the censure and persecution of the Church, not only by taking upon themselves the office of teaching, but by some of the doctrines which they taught."¹ "It does not appear that *Waldo* and his *immediate* followers contemplated a separation from the Church, but rather a revival of personal religion within its pale, and a removal of some abuses and superstitions. . . . It seems clear, from the statements, or (what is even more important) the silence, of their persecutors and their own confessions (that is, from all the sources of information that we possess), that opposition *was not* directed against *some*

¹ Maitland's Facts and Documents, p. 677.

of the peculiar doctrines of the Romish Church.”¹ For instance, they held firmly to the doctrine of Transubstantiation, and believed that each individual could perform the service of the Mass. There is reason to believe that Waldo designed to form a new religious Order, like the Monks or Friars, under the sanction of the Romish See, but failed in his object.

We have before us, then, the Waldenses, or a sect within the Church, differing in many respects from its doctrines, yet agreeing with it in many of its peculiar characteristics—submitting to its opposition and persecution. But besides these, many of them were scattered abroad by the persecutions, and became associated with the Albigenses, and were dispersed over the greater part of Europe. There they remained until the Reformation, and were among the first to join that movement. This fact will go far to account for the confusion of names so often found in speaking of these people.

Of that part of the followers of Waldo which joined the Albigenses, and by which the doctrines of the latter were much modified, we need not say anything further. Ecclesiastically they became the same “*people*,” a part of the same sect, bearing the same relation to the identity of the Church.

But of the other part of the Waldenses, we need say nothing further than that, as a sect *in the Church*, they had ceased their existence before the commencement of the Reformation. But if they had not, they would not require to be considered as a distinct branch of the Church.

¹ Maitland as above p. 467.

So far, then, as our present purpose is concerned, we may regard these two sects, that is, the Albigenses and the Waldenses, except that portion of them which never separated from the Church of Lyons, where they were born, as being but one. Shall we now claim for them the name and character of a Church, properly so called? This word either denotes *the* Church—that is, the Church universal—or a particular branch of it; and, in this last case, it must be the Church of some particular place, and have a local habitation—a geographical position on the surface of the earth. Of what territory or country were they the Church? Of Albigesium? If so, then of course they were schismatics whenever they went into any other territory already occupied by the Church, and set up their independent and rival jurisdiction there. But they were not the Church of Albigesium—that Church was established long before these emissaries from Thrace came thither with their peculiar doctrines: they neither claimed nor received communion with the Church of Albi—were in no way merged in or identified with it while they remained—but always continued to be a distinct, a rival, and an opposing body. They were a sect of human origin at the first, and that they continued to be until they were lost in the sects that arose at the time of the Reformation.

It is evident therefore, that nothing can be gained by any modern sect in the point of identity with the Church of Christ, from a connection with the Albigenses or Waldenses. They constituted no distinct part of the Church—no branch of the original vine.

As a church they had not existed from the Apostles' days, in a distinct individual capacity: and, therefore, they were not of Apostolical origin. They never were in communion with any part of the Apostolical Church, for a moment, from the very commencement of their existence as a sect. They never held or claimed the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of any one portion of the habited globe; but were always a sect living within the limits of, and in opposition to, a branch of the Church whose catholicity was not questioned by them, and whose right to jurisdiction is undeniable.

The efforts of Waldo and his immediate followers, so far as they aimed only at a reformation, and the restoration of pure religion, cannot fail to elicit our most cordial sympathy. But we must not attribute to him an infallibility, nor let our admiration and approbation of his course follow him any farther than he followed the only infallible Standard and Guide of human actions. I readily concede that his views were a vast improvement upon the Church dogmas of the age and country in which he lived. But when he consented to become the founder of a sect—to lay an “other foundation” whereon for others to build—he violated a fundamental law of God—a law which, I suppose, I have sufficiently developed, as the Second Principle of Church Extension,¹ and which every sect and denomination of our land sanctions by its own use. It is the law of unity. Take the case of any village or community in which there is a parish of Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, or Congregationalists even,

¹ Chap. ii.

sufficient to accommodate all the persons of that way of thinking in that place, and where there is no prospect of an increase of numbers, and what they have are only sufficient for the support of the ministrations of the one parish; and none of these denominations will allow their members to form a new parish in that place, necessarily weakening, as it will the old one and presenting an occasion for inevitable rivalry, opposition, and contention, between those who are thus unnecessarily divided. The organized seceders would not be recognized in such a case as a church of their denomination by any of these sects, nor allowed a seat in their Council, Presbytery, Conference, or whatever may be the name by which they designate their deliberative body next above the parish.

Now, assuredly we cannot deny that the Church of Christ has the power which they claim for their own, to preserve its unity, and protect itself from the identification with itself of other bodies heterogeneous to its own, and containing principles fundamentally repugnant to those on which its existence depends.

I am aware that I have given an account of the Waldenses and Albigenses somewhat different from those which are the most popularly received. The truth of the case is, that but little has been known about these sects until quite lately. And writers who felt the awkwardness of their position in advocating the ecclesiastical character of churches unconnected with the past, as well as those who, though they were in no such position, were, nevertheless, bent on making out the theory that the Church of Rome is the

anti-Christ spoken of in the Scriptures, and needed these sects for the "*two witnesses*," have seized upon, here and there, a fact or an isolated expression, and in some cases even drawn upon their fancy for facts, to make out such an account of them as would best subserve the purposes of their respective theories. But the publication of *The Facts and Documents* relating to them by Mr. Maitland, has revealed a state of facts which yields but little support to those theories and has completely dissipated the hopes of their advocates. It is from this source that the foregoing account of those mediæval sects has been chiefly derived.

Before proceeding any further in our attempt to identify the Church since the Reformation, and in order to make our way perfectly sure before us, let us pause and consider whether the Church had become apostate at or before the time when the Reformation commenced. That darkness, gross darkness, corruption, and superstition, had covered, as it were, the face of the earth, admits of no denial. It is the opinion of some, that "there was a time when the Church was so essentially corrupt, that she ceased to be a Church of Christ, and her officers ceased to be ministers of Christ." If so, then, any connection with the past, through that channel, can be of no avail.

We might here enter a plea of exception in favor of the Eastern Churches, on the ground that they were not involved in the same corruptions as the Churches in the Roman Obedience. But it is unnecessary to attend to that suggestion here, for several reasons.

Those that bring this charge against the Churches in the Roman Obedience, extend it also to those in the East. And besides, none of the sects that we shall notice claim to have been derived from the Eastern Church.

Now, looking at the Church simply as a visible society, we may say that it is not apostate, or extinct, so long as it has within itself the powers of recovery and reformation. If it has the Ministry and the Scriptures, it is competent to all the ecclesiastical functions necessary to life and vigor. Now, that the Churches in the Roman Obedience were capable of reformation, is a position that has never been denied, that I know of, and I presume it never will.

There is one important consideration in relation to this subject to be derived from the history of the Council of Trent. This Council was not held until after the Reformation had commenced. The English Church took no part in it, and never assented to its doings. Now, until this Council, the Churches in the Roman Obedience were not committed to many of the worst abuses and corruptions which were then incorporated into their Rule of Faith. These abuses and corruptions were in existence, and had been approved and allowed by Provincial Councils; but their formal adoption of them, as necessary to salvation, at the Council of Trent, put the whole Roman Church into an entirely new position in its relation to the Catholic Church of Christ. And it would certainly be much more difficult to defend it against the charge of apostasy since that Council than before; that is, since the

Reformation, than before. Until that time, they were historically a part of "*the people*" to whom the Kingdom was given—they had the Ministry and the Scriptures, and they had not formally and professedly set forth any new Rule of Faith peculiar to themselves, and excluding from the Christian estate, or condition, all who do not adopt their rule.¹

But since the Council of Trent we have at least two new doctrines set forth as "*of the Faith*" and therefore necessary to be believed by all who would hope for salvation—the immaculate conception of our Lord and the infallibility of the Pope.

In closing this part of my subject, I will use the language of the Rev. Dr. Lathrop, of West Springfield, Mass. The origin of the passage is worthy of note. He and his people had been imposed upon by a man claiming to be a minister of Christ. The Doctor wrote two sermons on Matt. vii, 15, 16, ["Beware of false prophets," etc.,] in which he occupied nearly the whole of the first sermon in proving that "they who refuse to enter into office in the way which the Gospel prescribes, are to be rejected: they have one plain mark of false teachers." The doctor considers "the way which the Gospel prescribes" to be ordination by those that were in the ministry before them. Perceiving that this position implied the necessity of an Apostolic Succession, and that the validity of such a succession depended upon the Church's not having become apostate before the Reformation, he adds to his sermons

¹ I refer to Creed of Pius IV, A. D. 1569, which will be given in a subsequent Section.

an Appendix, in which he discusses these points. I now quote his words: "But will history support this conclusion? Did the first Reformers, distrusting their past ordination, receive one from their lay brethren? The contrary is most evident. The Protestant Reformers in England early drew up a confession of their faith, in which, as Dr. Burnet says, 'they censure any who should take upon them to preach, or administer the sacraments, without having lawfully received the power from the *ministers*, to whom *alone* the right of conferring that power doth appertain.' Certainly they had no apprehension that the ministerial succession was at an end. . . .

"Though corruptions early began in the Christian Church, yet their progress was gradual and slow. In every age many dissented from them; great opposition was made to them, and large councils of Bishops or ministers condemned them. The Western, or Roman, Church ultimately carried her corruptions to a more extravagant height than the Oriental, or Greek, Church; but even in the former they never came to their crisis, until the famous Council of *Trent*, which was opened more than twenty and closed more than forty years after the beginning of Luther's Reformation. That Council, called by the Pope's bull, and supported by the Emperor's arms, in opposition to the Reformers, established, as Dr. Tillotson says, 'several articles which had never been acknowledged by any general council.' Those new articles, if avowed by some, yet had not been generally received in their full extent, as now declared. If they had been decreed

by one council, it was but a partial one, and they were soon after condemned by another; and, therefore, were not to be considered as the received and acknowledged doctrines of the Church. . . .

“Luther and his associates, in their first opposition to the errors of the Roman Church, did not consider her as having *essentially* departed from the Gospel, or as being utterly disowned by Christ; for their primary object was not to withdraw from her, but to effect a Reformation by means which might preserve the general union. They never renounced her, until they and their adherents were excommunicated, and all hopes of union were cut off; but, on the contrary, demanded a *free* and *general* council, to deliberate on means of accomplishing the Reformation so much desired. When Luther was constrained to disclaim that Church, Dr. Mosheim observes, ‘he separated himself from it, only as it acknowledged the Pope to be infallible; not from the Church, considered in a more extensive sense; for he submitted to the decision of the *universal* Church, when that decision should be given in a general council, lawfully assembled.’ ‘This,’ says Dr. McClaine, ‘was a judicious distinction; for though the papacy was confounded with the Catholic Church [Roman]¹ they were in reality, different things. The papacy had, indeed, by degrees, incorporated itself into the Church; but it was a preposterous supplement, and as foreign to its genuine constitution, as a

¹ It is surprising to see how generally writers have agreed in applying to the Roman branch of the Church the title “Catholic,” which belongs to the whole Church, as though the Roman were the whole and *only* Church.

new citadel, erected by a successful usurper, would be to an ancient city.'

"One cannot but feel the striking contrast between those ancient reformers who labored to correct the errors, without breaking the union of the Church, and certain modern pretenders, who in the first instance separated themselves from the churches, and then exclaiming against them as corrupt, promote and *encourage divisions in them*.

"It will, perhaps, be asked: 'How do we know but the first Reformers had been ordained by some of the vilest men in the Roman Church?' But let me ask, How do we know, or is it probable this was the case? The Reformers themselves appear to have entertained no scruples on this head. Let it still be remembered, that irregularity in ordinations was not made matter of complaint against her; and that her corruptions had not so recently risen to their height; and that she had not yet established, by a general council, her grossest errors, nor expelled her purest members.

"But admitting that a man of corrupt principle and morals, acts in an ordination, will his character nullify the transaction? As long as the Scribes sat in Moses's seat, Christ acknowledged them as officers of the Jewish Church; nor did he deny the authority of the High Priest, though his personal character was far from recommending him.

"The person ordained derives his authority to preach from Jesus Christ; not from the men who ordain him. They indigitate the person to be vested

with this authority, and officially install him in the regular exercise of it; but it is Christ's Gospel, not their will, which must direct him in the execution of his office. If they are corrupt in principles or manners, it will not thence follow that *he* must preach heresy or immorality. He is ordained to preach the Gospel; and whoever may ordain him, the charge which he receives, and the vow which he makes, bind him to teach not the commandments of men, but all things whatsoever Christ has commanded."¹

I am sure my readers will pardon this long quotation from one, of whom it has justly been said, "Perhaps there was no minister in the whole circle of the Congregational churches of New England, more respected by his cotemporaries, or who exercised greater influence among them," when he says so much that is to our present point so much better than I could say it myself.

The reader will also bear it in mind, that it has been no part of my undertaking to say that the corruptions and the darkness of the ages antecedent to the Reformation have been greatly exaggerated; though there may be good reason for saying so. I have rather chosen to show that even the Roman Church had not become apostate—that is, had not ceased to exist as a *Church of Christ*.

I am well aware that the great body of the Reformers, and, indeed, of the Protestants generally, have regarded the Pope as the Anti-Christ. Without either admitting or denying the correctness of the opinion in

¹ Wainwright's Ed. 1844, pp. 111-119.

this place, I will only say that, if it be correct, it does not involve the conclusion, or admission, that the Churches subject to him are apostate. Whether the Pope be Anti-Christ or not, it is evident, from the Scriptures, that the Anti-Christ was to manifest himself in the Church; and, perhaps, I may say that it is equally as manifest, on a careful inspection of the prophecies concerning him, that the Church, over which he should usurp his authority, would not thereby become apostate, though subjugated to an anti-Christian power. The sheep which the wolf worries and rends, do not thereby become wolves. Nay, if the Pope is Anti-Christ, the very Reformation, which was a refusing to hear and obey him, is proof that the part, at least, which reformed, was not apostate, or involved in his condemnation.

We now come around again to the point that we occupied at the close of the preceding chapter. At the commencement of the Reformation the Church of Christ was separated into two communions. The Oriental Church prevailed in *Russia, Liberia, Poland, European Turkey, Servia, Moldavia, Wallachia, Greece, the Archipelago, Crete, Cyprus, the Ionian Islands, Georgia, Circassia, Mingrelia, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine and Egypt*.¹ The Western Church, or the Roman Obedience included, therefore the whole of Europe, west of *Russia, Poland, and European Turkey*.

Palmer, in his *Treatise on the Church*,² has entered

¹ Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*, Vol. I. p. 176, N. Y. Ed. 1841.

² Vol. I. p. 198, et seq.

into an interesting calculation of the relative portions of the Church that adhered to the two heads of this division. As the result of his computation, he says: "It is impossible to determine, precisely, the number of Bishops on each side; but there is neither proof nor presumption, that *the majority* of the Church took part with the Roman Pontiff against the Greeks: and it is impossible to affirm with any certainty that the Western Churches were greater than the Eastern, up to the period of the Reformation."

CHAPTER IV.

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND.

AT the time of the introduction of Christianity, the Roman Empire included nearly the whole of the known world. This Empire was divided, in the first place, into *Dioceses*, which were the largest divisions. Each Diocese contained several *Provinces*, and these Provinces were again subdivided into *Parishes*. Each city was under the immediate government of certain magistrates within its own body, at the head of which was an officer called *Dictator* or *Defensor civitatis*, and whose power extended not only over the city, but over all the adjacent territory, commonly called the *proasteia* or *paroikia* [Parish], the suburbs or lesser towns belonging to its jurisdiction. Such, for the most part, were the cities spoken of in the Testament, in which we read of Churches being established. Each such city had a separate government by itself, and was, to a very great extent, independent of all others. This constitutes what in modern ecclesiastical language, is called a *Diocese*. Several of these divisions of the Empire conjoined into one, made the next

larger division, or a *Province*, subject to the authority of one chief magistrate, who resided in the *metropolis* or chief city of the *Province*.

The necessities of the Churches, to say nothing of the intention of their Founder, soon led to an association of the several Dioceses in a Province for purposes of mutual edification and helpfulness. All the early records of the Church speak of the Diocesan Churches as having one man at their head, called by a variety of names, "*Apostle*," "*Angel*," "*President*," "*Papa*," etc., etc., but more generally, and always in the Canons, or laws of Discipline, "*Bishop*," that is, "*overseer*"—to whom alone was reserved the right of ordaining the clergy. The very oldest canon or Church law, in existence, requires, that for the Ordination of one of these Bishops, there should be, at least, two or three Bishops present, and assisting, while each Bishop was allowed alone and by himself to ordain the other clergy of his Diocese. In the same code, which, as I have already said, is the earliest code that has come down to us—reaching back, as some of its Canons doubtless do, to near the time of the death of St. John the Apostle, it is ordained as follows:

"Let there be a meeting of the Bishops [in a Province] twice a year, and let them examine amongst themselves the decrees or canons concerning religion, and settle the ecclesiastical controversies which may have occurred." (Can. XXXVII.)

The Bishop of the metropolis of the Province was called *Metropolitan* or *Arch-Bishop*.

Hence the IX Canon of the Council of Antioch, A. D. 341, ordains :

“ It behooves the Bishops in every Province to own him who presides over the Metropolis, and who is to take care of the whole Province; because all who have business come together from every side to the Metropolis. Wherefore, also, it has been decreed that he should have precedence of rank, and that the other Bishops should do nothing of consequence without him, according to the ancient Canons, which we have received from our Fathers : or at any rate, only those things which belong to each particular parish [Diocese in the modern sense of the word] and the districts which are under it. For each Bishop is to have authority over his own Parish [Diocese], and to administer it with that piety which concerns every one, and to make provision for all the district which is under his City, to ordain Presbyters and Deacons, and to determine everything with judgment ; but let him attempt nothing further without the Bishop of the Metropolis ; and let him not do anything without the consent of others.” This same principle had been acted upon long before and was included in the Apostolic canons, Can. XXXIV.

Ere long, however, there was occasion for a still more extensive association, and the Bishops and Churches of several Provinces began to meet together. And then the several provinces in one of the larger divisions of the Empire, called a Diocese, as the term was then used, were associated in a sort of ecclesiastical union, and the Bishop of the chief city,

who was called a "*Patriarch*," or "*Exarch*," resided. Of this subdivision of the Church we find many proofs in the early Canons. The XVII. Canon of Chaledon [A. D. 451,] decreed that "If any [Bishop] is wronged by his Metropolitan, he is to be judged by the Exarch of the diocese," or by the Emperor. (See also Can. IX.)

Yet even among these Patriarchs there must needs be some order of precedence. The first Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, therefore decreed (Can. III.) "That the Bishop of Constantinople shall have the Primacy of Honor, after the Bishop of Rome, because that Constantinople is New Rome."

The Council of Chalcedon A. D. 451, also decreed that "Following in all things the decisions of the Holy Fathers, and acknowledging the Canon [of Constantinople just read,] they do also determine and decree the same things respecting the privileges of the most Holy city of Constantinople, New Rome. For the Fathers properly gave the primacy to the Throne of the Elder Rome, because that was the imperial city." (Canon XXVIII.)

The Emperor Justinian also decreed :

"We decree according to the decision of the Canons, that the most Holy Archbishop of the elder Rome, should be altogether first of all the Priests, and that the most Holy Archbishop of Constantinople, which is New Rome, should have the second rank after the most holy Apostolic throne of the elder Rome." (*Novell* 132, c. 2.)

The jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome at this time,

however, was bounded an the North by the Patriarchate of Milan,¹ that is, about the parallel of north latitude, 44 degrees, and extended south, including the Peninsula of Italy, and the Islands of Sardinia, Corsica, and Sicily. Beyond these limits he was not acknowledged to have any more authority than any other foreign Bishop whatever.

Thus was the Church of Christ—while it constituted one Body, one Church, divided and subdivided, each part being in perfect union, communion, and harmony with each other. And when, therefore, the ancient writers spoke of *churches* in the plural number, they always meant these subdivisions, one, and only one, of which existed in the same subdivision of the Empire, and not as we now do, the several denominations or churches in the same place. A Church was then as intimately and inseparably connected with a locality and territorial limits from which it derived its specific name, as was a civil government, a Pro-consul, or an Emperor.

Among these separate and distinct subdivisions of the Church, that of England was one. Nothing in history is more certain than the perfect and entire independence of the English Church of any foreign Bishop or Church for the first five hundred years. The best proof of this is found in the history of the missionary labors of *Augustine*.

About the middle of the sixth century, the Saxons, a heathen people from the continent, overrun the

¹Theodoret Eccl. Hist. B. H. c. XV. compared with Athanasius Epist. ad Solitar in Bingham, B. IX. c. 1.

whole of the North and East of England. Gregory, Bishop of Rome, sent Augustine as a missionary to convert them. On his arrival he found that the British Church remained complete in its organization, and in full operation in what is now called Wales—or the western part of England. He called their Bishops together, seven in number, and had a conference with them. He found that their rites did not correspond with those used in the Church of Rome in all respects, and that they had never acknowledged any dependence upon the Roman See. He then proposed that they should confirm and acknowledge the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome. This they positively refused to do.

The reply was given by Dinoh, *Abbot of Bangor*, as follows:

“Be it known to you beyond a doubt, that we are all and each one of us, obedient and subject to the Church of God and the Pope of Rome, and to every other true and pious Christian, to the extent of loving each of them in word and deed, as the sons of God; but other obedience than this I do not know to be justly [*vindicari et postulari*] claimed and proved to be due to him whom you call ‘Father of the Fathers.’¹ And this obedience we are willing to give and perform to him and to every other Christian continually. But for anything further we are under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Cærleon upon the Uske (now St. Davids) who is, under God, to take the oversight of us and make us pursue a spiritual life.”²

¹ A title which Augustine had given the Bishop of Rome.

² Spelman's *Conc. Brit.* an. 601.

Of course this proof is conclusive and beyond exception. The British Church up to that time A. D. 601, had never acknowledged the Roman Primacy or Supremacy at all, or in any form or to any extent. Three of its Bishops were at the Council of Arles A. D. 314. St. Athanasius says also that there were British Bishops at the Councils of Nice A. D. 325 and Sardica 347.¹

These councils were held, the one in the South of France, the other was in what is now called European Turkey. The presence of her Bishops in these councils, proves that the Church of England was then in communion with the rest of the Church.

It would seem from the circumstances of the case, that even the Bishop of Rome did not know that there were any Christians in England, and perhaps did not know, except in a most general way, that there was any such place—*island or continent*—as England.

Nor is this all; the differences in opinion and usage showed that the old British Church had derived, if not its existence, yet its Liturgy and ritual from the church in the south of France, before the influence of the Bishop of Rome had extended to them. This Church had been founded, not by Rome or from Rome at all, but by missionaries from Ephesus, and they brought with them the Liturgy and rites of that Church—the Church of the home of the last of the Apostles, St. John.

One of the points of difference was in regard to the keeping of Easter. We can explain this easily as fol-

¹ Apol. Introduc. § 1.

lows: The Declaration of the American Independence was made on *Thursday*, July the *fourth*. Now, suppose that all the States wish to celebrate the day; but there is a difference of opinion among them, some preferring to celebrate it on the *fourth* day of July, on whatever day of the week it may happen to come, and others, thinking it best to celebrate it on the first *Thursday* in July, whether it occurs on the first or any subsequent day until the seventh. The Church of Rome kept Easter on the first Sunday after the full moon next after the vernal equinox, as had been decided by the Council of Nice A. D. 325. Whereas the British Church kept it, as many of the Churches in the East had done, on the same day of the Jewish month as that on which our Lord had risen from the dead—whatever day of the week it might happen to be.

There can be no doubt that Gregory, canonized as a saint, and called the Great, was one of the best and holiest men that ever lived. Nor need we doubt that Augustine, notwithstanding some infirmities of temper, undertook the mission to England in the purest spirit of missionary zeal. But he found things there, on his arrival, or soon afterwards, quite unlike what he had expected. In view of the fact that there was a Church in full organization and operation, in Wales, in Ireland and in Scotland, and doubtless many remains of the old British population, scattered throughout the country, notwithstanding the Saxon conquest and the differences in ritual already alluded to, Augustine wrote back to Gregory for instructions. The answer of Gregory, in reply, is worthy of note. He

writes to Augustine: "You, my brother, are acquainted with the customs of the Roman Church, in which you have been brought up. But it is my pleasure, that if you have found anything either in the Roman or *the Gallican, or any other Church*, which may be more acceptable to Almighty God, you carefully make choice of the same, and sedulously teach the "Church of the Angles," (not the Britons) "which is at present new in the Faith, whatsoever you can gather from the several churches. For things are not to be loved for the sake of the places, but places for the sake of the good things that are in them. Select, therefore, from each Church those things that are pious, religious and correct. When you have made these up into one body, instill them into the minds of the English for their use."¹

Augustine, however, and his company went on with their work, and the British Church continued its separate existence for a while, until the whole Island had been reconverted when the ancient British and the converted Saxons were united into one Church, as the Heptarchy had been united under one Monarch.

The following is given as the respective dates of the conformity of the several Dioceses, and parts of the country. The greater part of Anglia, 631; Northumbria, 634; Mercia, 655; Essex, 660; Cornwall acquiesced, 905; Cambria, 908; Wales, 1135-1150.

At the close of the eleventh century William, Duke of *Normandy*, formed a design to place himself on the

¹ Bede, H. Eccl., B. I, § 27.

throne of England. In this he was encouraged by *the Pope*, Alexander II., who was probably no less anxious to gain an ecclesiastical supremacy over England, than William was to gain the crown. Accordingly, they encouraged and assisted each other until, by steps and means which I shall not now stop to specify, the Church of England was reduced to a pretty complete subjugation to the Papal Supremacy.

In the first half of the sixteenth century, Henry VIII, King of England, having married the widow of his deceased brother, began to entertain doubts of the lawfulness of the marriage, and, as the usage then was, appealed to the Pope as the highest ecclesiastical authority commonly recognized. The Pope did not readily decide in the affirmative, for fear of displeasing Charles V, of Spain; nor in the negative, lest he offend Henry. This occasioned a vexatious delay, which had the effect to diminish very considerably the regard which was generally felt for the Pope in England. At length, Henry, by the advice of some of the wisest divines in his country, determined to revive the old freedom from Romish authority, and declare the independence of the English Church, and decide his own question in his own realm.

Corruptions in doctrine, and abuses of jurisdiction of the most gross character, had also long been calling for reformation. But these evils seemed to be inseparably connected with the supremacy of the Pope, and he steadfastly opposed any adequate measures for reform. Accordingly it began to be discussed in the Universities, and by the learned men of the kingdom

generally—whether the Bishop of Rome had any right to that supremacy which he was exerting with such destructive influence over England. And in the spring of 1534, the whole Church of England, assembled in their usual mode of Convocations—of which there were two, one of Canterbury, the other of York—very unanimously resolved, that the Bishop of Rome had, by divine right, no more authority in England than any other foreign Bishop whatever.¹

The Church of England was, as we have seen, divided at this time into two Archbishops—Canterbury and York. Each Province had a Convocation of its own. And, besides the Acts of King and Parliament, which settled the matter so far as the *civil* law was concerned, we have the Acts of the Convocation of Canterbury, March 31, 1534, declaring “that the Roman Bishop has no greater jurisdiction given him by God, in this kingdom, than any other foreign Bishop.” The Act of York was June 1st, of the same year, and in these words: “The Roman Bishop has not in the Holy Scriptures any greater jurisdiction in the Kingdom of England than any other foreign Bishop.” On May 2d, of the same year, the University of Cambridge adopted the Canterbury Form, and on the 27th of July following, the University of Oxford adopted the Form which had been adopted at York; the opinion was nearly universal. The Archbishop of York said that he did not know of more than twelve of the secular clergy and but few friars that dissented. The opinion was nearly universal against the Pope.

¹ Collier, vol. vi. p. 266.

Thus the Church of England was declared free and independent; and proceeded to a reformation of errors and abuses in doctrine and in morals. But no changes were made in the constitution and organization of the Church except merely the removal of the Papal authority, and the abuses dependent upon it. No clergymen of any order were removed from office, no new ones appointed into their places—no new congregations gathered—no new Churches built in place of the old. It was in all respects the old Church going on in a regular and orderly way, doing her work of preaching the Gospel, administering the Sacraments and edifying the body of Christ, as before, with the exception of the Papal Supremacy.

This rejection of the Papal Supremacy took place in 1534. There was, at that time, and for centuries before there had been, but one Church or religious communion in England. And for more than thirty years after this event there was only one—and that one, before the Reformation as after it, was called and known as the Church of England. About thirty years after this date, the Puritans and the Papists began to separate from the Church and form themselves into sects by themselves.

We are not, however, to suppose that the change in opinion in the English took place all at once. More than one hundred years before, the celebrated Wickliffe had preached a reformation and inculcated doctrines contrary to the prevailing errors of the times which had never been eradicated or fully suppressed. On the contrary, they had been gaining ground until,

in the middle of the sixteenth century, they were entertained by the majority of the Church, and a favorable time had come for a reformation in accordance with them. The friends of the Reformation had, however, always remained in the Church, except when the Church itself excommunicated them, and then they formed themselves into no rival or opposing communion. At the Reformation there was a minority opposed to it. Among them occur the distinguished names of Fisher, of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, men of unquestionable learning, integrity and piety—as well as *Wolsey*, *Gardiner*, and *Bonner*, of whom a different character must be given. And even for thirty years and more, after the Reformation, we find many persons opposing its principles, and yet they did not separate from the English Church or form themselves into a new communion.

And with regard to More and the few others who did not acquiesce in the movements of Henry, we know that in regard to many of them their objection did not arise from attachment to the Papal Supremacy, as an independent doctrine. But it arose rather from a fear of what Henry himself might do. His character was well understood. He was selfish, ambitious, and tyrannical. He *tried* to assume all the authority over the Church which the Bishop of Rome had exercised—except, perhaps, the purely clerical functions or ordination and such like. He not only claimed that nobody—Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, Papal legate, or the Pope himself—should exercise any authority in England or over the people of England, without his

consent and by his appointment. He even claimed the right to make visitations of the Churches, and to control and direct the exercises of the ministerial function in the most purely clerical duties. And More and others like him, fearing what Henry might do, preferred that *if they must have* such a tyranny exercised over them, it should be by some one in Holy Orders, even though he were a foreigner—the more remote and farther removed from England perhaps the better.

But as I have said, no change was made in the mode of Church government, except simply the abolition of the Papacy. In doctrines the English Church retained for their Rule of Faith, the Apostles' Creed (which had, in fact, been the only one that they had ever acknowledged to hold that place), though they drew up certain "*Articles agreed upon by the Arch-Bishops and Bishops of both Provinces and the whole Clergy, for the avoiding of diversities of opinions, and for the establishing consent touching true Religion.*" These Articles, after passing through several stages, finally became the XXXIXth Article as adopted in England, 1562; and, with a few modifications growing out of local circumstances and political considerations, adopted also by our Church in 1801. But these Articles were never declared articles *of the Faith*, or necessary to salvation. Nor were they ever imposed upon the laity at all, as a condition of communion. They were only an agreement among the clergy on certain points then chiefly in controversy. The only Creed, or Standard of Faith, adopted for admission and

communion in our Church, is that which is known as "the Apostles' Creed," in these words:

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth:

"And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary; Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified, dead and buried; He descended into hell, The third day he rose from the dead; He ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

"I believe in the Holy Ghost; The Holy Catholic Church; The Communion of Saints; The Forgiveness of Sins; The Resurrection of the body; and the Life everlasting."

For their Liturgy they revised the books then generally in use, purging them from the errors and superstitions that had crept into them. In all this, the one rule that they strictly adhered to, was to restore all things to a conformity, as near as possible, to the authentic documents of the first centuries.

They also translated the Scriptures, and used them in the Churches in the English language, and made provision for putting a copy into every family and into the hands of every individual that could read them.

We have seen that the Bishop of Rome had no authority in England for several centuries after the Church was established there. I have already quoted from the Canons or Laws of the Church, which were

acknowledged to be of authority by *the whole Church*. I will give one or two quotations more from the same authority. It must be remembered that they were passed at a time when the authority of the Bishop of Rome was confined, as we have seen above, to the Peninsula of Italy, and the adjacent Islands. In almost every Council anterior to that of Ephesus A. D. 431, there had been something said to prevent the ambition of the Bishops from going beyond their limits to extend their authority over others. In this state of things the Council of Ephesus passed the following law, Canon VIII.

“The most beloved of God and our fellow Bishop Rheginus, and Zeno, and Euagrius, the most religious Bishops of the province of Cyprus, who were with him, have declared unto us an innovation which has been introduced contrary to the laws of the Church and the Canons of the Holy Fathers, and which affects the liberty of all. Wherefore, since evils which affect the community [*i. e.*, the whole Church] require more attention, inasmuch as they cause greater hurt, especially since the Bishop of Antioch has not so much as followed an ancient custom in performing ordinations in Cyprus, as those most religious persons who have come to the holy Synod have informed us, by writing and by word of mouth, we declare that they who preside over the Holy Churches which are in Cyprus, shall preserve, without gainsaying or opposition, their right of performing by themselves the ordinations of the most religious Bishops, according to the Canons of the Holy Fathers, and the ancient customs. The same

rule shall be observed *in all the other* Dioceses, and in the Provinces *everywhere*, so that none of the most religious Bishops shall invade *any other* Province which has not heretofore *from the beginning*, been under the hand of himself, or his predecessors. But if any one has so invaded a Province, and brought it by force under himself, he shall restore it, that the Canons of the Fathers may not be transgressed, *nor the pride of secular dominion be privily introduced under the appearance of a sacred office, nor we lose by little and little the freedom which our Lord Jesus Christ, the Deliverer of all men, has given us by his blood.* The holy and œcumenical Synod has, therefore, decreed, that the rights which have heretofore, and from the beginning, belonged to each Province, shall be preserved to it pure and without restraint, according to the custom which has prevailed of old, each Metropolitan having permission to take a copy of the things now transacted for his own security. But if any shall introduce any regulation contrary to what has been now defined, the *whole holy* and œcumenical Synod has decreed that it shall be of no effect."

I trust to my reader's knowledge of the *Scriptures* to satisfy him that they afford no proof that any superiority was given to the Bishop of Rome by Divine Authority over the whole Church of Christ. This Canon is proof that the *Primitive Church* neither recognized nor allowed any. If, then, he had usurped it, or acquired it in any way, any branch of the Church which was originally independent and complete in itself might set it aside.

But the main point for our present purposes is the fact that this Reformation constituted no new Church. *The Church of England reformed itself.* There was but one religious denomination in England before 1534. There was but one for more than thirty years afterward: and that one was the same identical body through the whole interval. There was no change in its name or form of organization, no turning out old clergy and appointing new, no gathering new congregations from the old, no separation of the clergy from the laity, but a quiet, orderly, and harmonious progress in the work of Reformation.

In 1569, more than thirty years after the rejection of the Papal Supremacy—after the reign of Mary, and after several ineffectual efforts to get Queen Elizabeth and the English Church to recognize again the Papal Supremacy, the advocates of the old papal abuses, having lost all hope of gaining the ascendancy in the Church of England again, left it and organized a Papal sect, which, however, was very small in point of numbers. Subsequently, the partisans of the peculiarities of the Calvinistic theory, despairing of gaining the ascendancy in the Church, withdrew also and formed another sect. But still the Church included the vast majority of the people of England. No one of these sects of seceders claimed to be the Church which had existed in England for centuries. Such a claim was too obviously absurd, and contrary to all facts, and all principles of identity, to be thought of, even by those whose interests were the most concerned in making it.

Hence, there was no new communion formed, no

new Rule of Faith adopted, no new terms of communion proposed, no new name assumed, no new standard set up, nothing new except a *new* return to *old* truths, a renewed inculcation of the Faith once delivered to the Saints.

It is desirable to show, not only that the Reformation did not establish "the Church of England" as a new sect, but also that it was not so regarded by the enemies of the Reformation themselves.

This appears from several facts, no less clearly than from declarations in express words.

After the accession of Mary, 1553, when she determined to restore Popery in England, no changes were required except that the Bishops and Clergy should conform to the Romish Faith and Obedience. If they would have done that, they need not be molested or disturbed. So, likewise, in the early years of Elizabeth's reign. While the Pope was endeavoring to regain the ascendancy which he lost when she came to the throne, he did not declare the Church of England a mere new sect that had sprung up, but he was willing to receive it collectively as a Church—acknowledging the validity of its ordinations, if it would acknowledge his supremacy and conform in some few particulars to his will.

But most of all: after he had succeeded in getting a sect of seceders from the Church to profess their adherence to him, he did not even then call his followers in England "the Church of England." And though he sent Bishops there, he did not call them Bishops of London, of Durham, of Winchester, etc., etc.,

after the Sees from which the Bishops in the English Church for centuries had taken their titles, and from which they take them to this day; but he gave them a fictitious title, derived from no place whatever, as Bishop of Melipotamus [Honey-River], etc., etc.

Now from these facts it is perfectly certain, that the Church of Rome did not regard its adherents in England as the Church *of England*, and that it did so regard the Church which had thrown off the Papal yoke.

It appears thus, from the admission of her enemies, no less than from her own claims and from the indisputable and insuperable facts in the case, that the Church of England did not originate at the time of the Reformation, or lose her identity by the change; and by rejecting the Papal Supremacy, she only gained the independence to which, by the Scriptures and the ancient laws of the Church, she was most fully and most indefeasibly entitled.

Since the Reformation in England, the Church of England has been in communion with the Eastern Churches. They have mutually recognized each other to be true branches of the Church of Christ, acknowledging the validity of each other's ordinations, conceding to each other the communion due from one branch of the Church of Christ to another, though there have been, and are still, some minor points of difference which both parties regard as important, though not essential to intercommunion.

Although we may say that the original Church is divided at present into three Communions, the Eastern, the Roman and the Reformed—including, in the

latter, all the Churches which she has established since her reformation, yet in fact they are but two—the Roman, on the one hand, and the Eastern and the Reformed [being in communion with each other], constituting the other.

In speaking of the Reformation in England, I do not intend to prejudice the character of any of the other reformations. I select England as the point of discussion, for several reasons. 1. Because the Church in that country is older than in any of the others where a Reformation has been effected. 2. Because that Church was so unquestionably independent for several centuries after its first planting. 3. Because the Reformation was there beyond the possibility of a denial—a reformation *in a branch of the Church*, and not the origination of a new Church or sect; and finally, 4. Because the Church of England has done more than all the other reformed Churches put together, in extending the Church, by establishing new and affiliated branches.

In what I shall have to say in the present chapter, I shall include with the Church of England, as a class of which that is a type and representative, all other Churches which have been founded by the Church of England, or which are in communion with her.

The early divisions in the Church were local; each division being called, also, a Church, and took its name from the place where it was situated. The only denominational difference known to the Scriptures or allowed in the Church, were derived from the place in which each Church was located. It was not a Presby-

terian church, a Methodist church, a Congregational church, etc. ; but it was the Church at Ephesus, the Church of Rome, the Church of England, etc., etc.

We have seen how these Churches were associated for provincial and still more general purposes. As early as the middle of the fifth century, Leo *the Great*, Bishop of Rome, had formed the design of an universal supremacy in the Church, for himself and his successors in the same See. And yet, more than a century after this, Gregory, also called *the Great*, Bishop of Rome, vehemently denounced the idea of any such supremacy. In his letter to *Mauritius*, the Emperor, he says : “ I am bold to say that whosoever uses or affects the style of universal Bishop [as the Arch-Bishop of Constantinople had done,] has the pride and character of Anti-Christ, and is in some measure his harbinger in this haughty quality of mounting himself above the rest of his order.” Writing to *Anastasius*, Bishop of Antioch, he says still further : “ This is a point of the last importance, neither can we comply with the innovation without betraying Religion, and adulterating the Catholic Faith?” Thus we see that in the sixth century, a Bishop of Rome could condemn as a characteristic of Anti-Christ, that for not believing in which a Bishop of the same See, in more modern centuries must declare persons out of communion with the Church, and cut off from its Invisible Head.

Jealousies had for a long time subsisted between the East and the West, before a final separation took place.

In A. D., 1053, Michael Cerularius, *Patriarch of Constantinople*, sent a letter to the Bishop of *Trani*, intended for the Bishop of *Rome*, complaining, as he had a right to do, of some of the rites and customs which the Bishop of Rome was encouraging in the Western Churches. Leo IX (for that was the name of the Bishop of Rome), complained of the interference of the Constantinople Bishop. In the next year he sent three Legates to Constantinople. Among these Legates was Cardinal *Humbert*, which was evidently an unfortunate selection. His language to Cerularius was arrogant and discourteous, and he closed by threatening him with excommunication, etc., if he did not reject, what Humbert was pleased to call his errors, and conform to the Romish usages. The Bishop of Constantinople would not yield, and before the Legates left the city they placed on the altar of St. Sophia's, a formal excommunication of Cerularius and his adherents. This was a most direct assumption of authority over Cerularius and the Eastern Church, of which he was the acknowledged head. It led to the division of the East and West, which exists to the present day.

At the Reformation, as we have seen, another division was occasioned. The contest then, also, was with the Romish claim to Supremacy. Yet not directly; for the Church of England probably would not have rejected that Supremacy if it had been kept within the bounds of the early canons, and had not indissolubly allied itself to some of the worst corruptions in morals, as well as doctrines, that were to be found in that age.

As England had the right to be free from Rome, and could not reform herself without, she exercised that right, and was anathematized by Rome for it.

This, of course, led to another division and alienation among Churches which are unquestionably Apostolic, and whose catholicity up to that day had never been called in question. We have not yet proceeded far enough in our work of historic identification to say with any definiteness how large a portion of the Churches, in the Roman Obedience, became separated from it by the Reformation. In England, Ireland, Scotland, Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, the Church of Rome made no pretensions of retaining the jurisdiction. She made no show even of setting up her claims for the individuals that still cherished a preference for her doctrines and usages, that they should be considered as the old Church in those countries, still in existence, though diminished in numbers. By her own confession, then, she lost the Churches in these several nations, from her Obedience.

Now, it cannot for a moment be pretended, with any show of reason, that any one of these parts of the Church lost its right, or its power, to spread the Gospel, in consequence of this alienation. If the Papal Supremacy were an essential element of the Church, then, of course, rejection *of* that supremacy—or rejection *by* it—would disable any Church from carrying on missionary operations. It might, indeed, preach and build, but it would be building on “another foundation,” and what it built would not be the Church of Christ.

Or again: if any one of these three parts, into which the Original and Primitive Church is divided, has set forth another Rule of Faith different from and inconsistent with that of the Primitive Church, so that in her missionary operations she is inculcating a Gospel different in its essential features from that preached by the immediate Evangelists and Apostles of our Lord, this fact may incapacitate them from effectual missionary labors.

I will not here stop to inquire how far Rome has laid a new foundation. But most assuredly the Church of England has not done it. Her Rule of Faith is the Apostles' Creed—the most simple—the most primitive, and the one that was and is now universally received. This she proposes as her Baptismal Confession of Faith. This is what she requires all of her members to be taught in her Catechism, and to renew their profession and confession in, in Confirmation, and this it is which she proposes to her members when about to leave the world as the Faith in which they are to be received by their Final Judge.

Nor does she put upon this Creed any new or peculiar construction of her own. Her solemn declaration is that her

“Preachers shall take heed that they teach nothing in their preaching which they would have the people religiously observe and believe, but that which is agreeable to the teaching of the Old Testament and the New, and that which the Catholic Fathers and the Ancient Bishops have gathered out of that very teaching.”¹

¹ Cardwell's *Synodalia*, vol. I, p. 126.

Again in the Canons of 1603, Canon XXX, the Church of England says: "Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practiced, that as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those *ceremonies* [even] which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity and from the Apostolic Churches, which were their first founders."

It has sometimes been said, that since the English Church and Bishops derived whatever authority they had from the Pope and Church at Rome, therefore, now that the Church of Rome has withdrawn that authority they are none the better for this connection with the past.

To this I reply in the first place that nothing occurred which either directly or by implication deprived the English Church or its Bishops of their ecclesiastical authority until the Bull of Pius V, February 23, 1569. This Bull declares "that those who adhere to Queen Elizabeth in the practices aforesaid"—the Reformation—"lie under the censure of anathema, and are cut off from the unity of the body of Christ." But the Pope had no authority at that time either in fact or by right over Elizabeth or the Church of England, and therefore his excommunication was of no force.

The Canon of Ephesus (Canon VIII), already cited,

settles this matter so far as church law can settle it. It is in fact the highest authority on earth, now that inspiration has ceased and the Canon of Holy Scripture is closed. Was it not the same authority that directed in the Council at Jerusalem (Acts xv) that the ritual of the Mosaic Law was not binding on Christians? "The Apostles, Elders and Brethren came together to consider the matter." The question was not one in regard to which they had been guided by that Inspiration by which they wrote the Scriptures; for they would not need to "consider" or discuss the matter at all; it was settled for them by authority. Nor was it one of those matters "pertaining to the Kingdom," with regard to which our Lord had given them instructions during "the great forty days;" for these also there would have been no occasion for "consideration" or arguments; a simple "the Lord hath said" would have been all that there was occasion or opportunity for.

But be this as it may; the Papal Supremacy had been abolished in 1534 by both Church *and* State;—the only authority that had given it, or could have given it so much as the semblance of a right to existence and exercise in England. From this time therefore until the accession of Mary, 1553, Bishops were selected and ordained without obtaining any authority or permission from the Pope—and without even consulting him at all. Again, after the accession of Elizabeth, 1558, the Papal Supremacy was again abolished, and from that time until the Bull of 1569, Bishops had also been ordained without consulting him at

all. Now it so happens that in 1569, when the Bull of excommunication was issued *there was not a single Bishop in the English Church who had been ordained under the Pope's supremacy*, or had in any way promised obedience to him or derived even a show of authority from him in any shape or form whatever. They had all been ordained under Edward the VI, before Mary's reign, or under Elizabeth after Mary's reign was over. Therefore the Bull of Pius V was of no force in invalidating the authority of the English Bishops that were then in office.

But finally, even before the Reformation the English Bishops were not considered as deriving their authority from the Pope. It was indeed one part of his supremacy that no Bishops should be chosen without his permission and approbation. The election of Bishops was as follows: The King granted to the Chapter, that is the Cathedral Clergy, of the vacant Diocese a *conge d'élire* [permission to elect]. They chose the man whom they desired for Bishop. The Bishop elect must then have the royal assent and be confirmed as Bishop elect by the Pope or his Legate. After which he was ordained by the Bishops whom the Pope named for that purpose. The Pope also, or his Legate, put upon the newly consecrated Bishop the pall and other insignia of his authority—which was called the "*Investiture*."¹ But his election and ordination gave the Bishop his authority as Bishop in the Church and his right to jurisdiction in the particular Diocese. Neither of them was derived from the Pope.

¹ Burns's Ecclesiastical Law, vol. i. p. 179.

There is therefore no sense in which the English Church or her Bishops had derived their authority from the Pope or Church of Rome, consequently no sense in which it could be taken away by Romish authorities.

Here then we have the Church of England unquestionably a part of the identical historic Church of Christ, deriving the origin of its existence from the very Apostles themselves, reformed from the corruptions and errors of the middle ages, returning to the teachings and standards of the Primitive Church—and disowned by Rome for so doing. If now this alienation is the annihilation of one or the other of the parties to the division, as Churches of Christ, there is no reason why this consequence should result to the Church of England rather than to the Church of Rome.

The alienation between these three branches of the Church, the *Eastern*, the *Roman*, and the *Reformed*, is undoubtedly an evil, and alike the result and the proof of sin. But most unquestionably neither the division nor the alienation terminates the visible existence of either of those branches. And I know of no reason why it should necessarily involve any one of them in apostacy from Christ. If they are apostate it must be for other reasons.

I am not anxious to conceal the fact, though the object we have now in view does not require any prolonged discussion of it—that there are also alienations and misunderstandings existing, to some extent, between the different branches of the Oriental Church.

And so, too, there are controversies and points of material difference, between the several Churches in the Roman Obedience, as, for instance, between those in France and Italy. From what has been said, it will appear that the Church, in any one or all of these separate or distinct nations, has a right to declare itself free and independent of the control of any foreign Bishop or Church whatever, if it should choose to do so.

Without saying, then, that there is a perfect harmony among all of the Branches in each of the great divisions of the Catholic Church of Christ—for that manifestly is not the case—I say that we may include all these Churches in three distinct classes.

1. The Eastern, including all those Branches of the Church which have never submitted to the Papal Supremacy—the Russian, the Greek, the Syrian, the Armenian, the Coptic, or Egyptian, the Abyssinian, etc.

2. The Churches that are yet in the Roman Obedience, as those of Austria, Italy, France, Spain, Portugal, etc.

3. Those Churches which were once subject to the Papal Supremacy, are now reformed and freed from it, as England, Ireland, Scotland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, etc., without naming now the midland nations of Europe, where, as we shall see by and by, the case is somewhat different; and omitting to mention, in this place, all those Churches that have been established by any of the Churches in this class since the Reformation.

In classing the churches of Norway, Sweden and

Denmark, with the Church of England, I do by no means intend to intimate that I consider them as occupying the same position in all respects. In some of those nations, there is no doubt that the Clergy, at the time of the Reformation, were driven off or out of their official positions, and others put in their places in a manner which was at variance with what has always been regarded in the Church as essential to the validity of the ministerial office. This, however, is a point that we need not discuss here. They are at least Churches that separated themselves at that time from the Roman Obedience ; and if their ministry is invalid or informal, the defect can be remedied, as was done with that in the Church of Scotland in 1610, when the regular succession having been lost, three Bishops were ordained for Scotland in London, and they on their return ordained others to supply the whole deficiency.

But no such imperfection or invalidity attaches to the Ministry of the English Church. They were neither driven off nor ejected at the Reformation, but, on the contrary, they were themselves the chief agents in carrying it on. And, in the ordination of their successors, all the rites that have ever been deemed essential in the Church, were carefully observed.

We have then, before our minds, one of the oldest branches of the Church of Christ, reaching back, in the commencement of its existence, to the very days of the Apostles, once subjugated to the Roman Supremacy—but now reformed and free,—in the full exercise of her functions as a Church of Christ, and as

unquestionably a part of that identical visible society which he and his Apostles founded as any other that can be named on earth ; disowned, indeed, by Rome for her Protestantism, but for that very reason owned and fellowshipped by Churches older than Rome herself, which were *in* Christ before the sound of the Gospel had ever been heard in the city of the seven hills. She has had, indeed, some vicissitudes of fortune, but through them all she has been the same—the Church of England—the only body of persons that ever claimed to be called by that name in England, or to which it was ever by any body, for one moment, supposed to belong.

CHAPTER V.

SECTS SINCE THE REFORMATION.

AT the time of the Reformation the idea of the Church had pretty much died out; or rather it had been absorbed into the idea of the Papacy. Few, very few, people had seen a complete copy of the Holy Scriptures, and most of clergy even, knew of only certain parts that occurred in their services. The publication of Wickliffe's Translation in England about 1360, nearly two hundred years before, had done a good deal towards producing a better state of things by diffusing a more general acquaintance with their contents, and giving quite a different turn to affairs from that which they took on the Continent.

The history of the Denominations or Sects which arose at the time of the Reformation hardly falls within the line of my argument as a positive element. It is rather of a negative character, and serves our purpose by way of contrast. I shall therefore give attention chiefly to the few of those that set up some claim to a continuity and perpetuation of the Church that was founded by the Apostles: of those that make no such claim very little need be said for our present purpose.

In considering these Sects we shall see that some of

them were formed by persons seceding directly from either the Roman or the Reformed Branches of the Church, some have been formed by divisions in those sects, and still another class have arisen as it were *de novo*, by some individual, collecting around him a number of persons from all sects, or that had belonged to no sect.

In this enumeration I shall have regard only to the sects in our own country. I shall in all cases take their own statements, and accounts of their origin; and when I can conveniently do so, I shall give those statements in their own language. My object will not lead me into any general account of their doctrines or of their principles of church-polity. Our attention is directed chiefly to their history as visible societies.

These Sects or Denominations are of three orders: *Primary*, or those that arose at the time of the Reformation, and in an effort at reformation; *secondary*, or those that have arisen by a secession from the Primary Sect; and *third, autothentic*, those that have arisen by gathering in persons that belonged to no denomination.

THE PRIMARY SECTS. Under this head, I include some nine or ten. The characteristic by which they are distinguished, is, that with one or two exceptions, they resulted from attempts at what was, or was regarded as, a reformation *in the Church* or some one of its Branches—the reformers, however, failing to have their views adopted by the Church, seceded with their adherents and became a sect. I shall take up the consideration of them in alphabetic order.

1. The Baptists. "The Baptist Church in this country was founded in *March*, A. D. 1639. Many of the first settlers in Massachusetts were Baptists, and as 'holy and watchful and fruitful and heavenly a people as perhaps any in the world,' says *Cotton Mather*. Roger Williams having escaped the intolerance of the *Puritans* of Massachusetts Bay, came to what is now called *Providence, Rhode Island*, in 1636, founded a Colony, and became its governor. He was a Baptist, and 'many of his people entertained his views.' But neither he nor any of them having been baptized, as they understood the rite, and 'there being no minister in New England who had been baptized by immersion on a profession of faith, in March, 1639, Ezekiel Holliman baptized Roger Williams, who then administered the rite to Holliman and ten others.' Williams had been ordained in the English Church. 'Thus was founded' under Roger Williams as Governor of Rhode Island, and minister of the Lord Jesus, and by Ezekiel Holliman, Deputy Governor, with ten others, the first Baptist Church on the continent of America."

For this quotation, and all my others when not otherwise indicated, I am indebted to a *History of the Baptists*, by the Rev. A. D. Gillette, pastor of the Eleventh Baptist Church, Philadelphia, published in Rupp's Collection, 1844.

But though this was the origin of the Baptist church in this country, it was not the origin of the communion to which it belongs. Our author claims:

"That persons holding Baptist sentiments have existed always in the Church; that for the first three or

four centuries after Christ, the whole church held to such sentiments, that at the time of the Reformation they became scattered throughout Europe and sprang up in part as a Baptist church. But the first *society* or *church* of Baptists which our author names is as follows: 'The British Baptists continued to multiply; and in 1689 they, with forty of their Bishops [preachers, for they had no Bishops in the established sense of the word] assembled in an association at London and adopted a confession of Faith; the same that was adopted by the Philadelphia association in 1742.'"

Mr. Gillette refers to nothing earlier than 1689 which can be regarded as the origin of the Baptists *as a church*; for a church is a society of persons, and implies not only the existence of the persons, but it also implies that they are gathered out of the rest of the world and brought together either in some place or within some definite and visible bond of union. *Mr. Gillette* points out no such association, which he recognizes as a Baptist church before the one named above in 1689.

There is no need that we should go into the history of the Baptists any farther, for the purposes of our present inquiry. Their claim is that the Baptist Church was founded by persons who seceded from the corrupt Church of Christ. Of course, therefore, the Baptist Church is another, and entirely distinct from that from which its founders seceded.

2. The Dutch Reformed Church. In speaking of this Sect I shall follow chiefly *Dr. Brownlee's Account of the Dutch Reformed church*, in *Rupp's Collection*—p. 220.

“The Dutch Reformed church is the oldest church in the United States, which adopts the Presbyterian form of church government. Its history begins with the history of New York and New Jersey. It is a branch of the National church of Holland.” The Dutch West India Company were the first who carried the ministers of the Gospel from Holland to our shores. Until 1772, they were dependent upon the *classis* in Holland.”

They receive, as their Rule of Faith, the Confession of Faith, etc., of the *Synod of Dort*.

Now upon this state of facts two questions arise, one relating to the Dutch Reformed church in the old country, and the other to its mission in this country.

On this point I freely confess, that I have not the means at hand to investigate the Reformation in the Netherlands so minutely as I should like; but still, I have enough for our present purpose.

At the commencement of the Reformation, as it is called, Netherlands consisted of four Dioceses. These, on the accession of Philip II. of Spain, were increased to fourteen.¹ Amsterdam was in the diocese of Haerlem. The Reformation was commenced by *individuals*, and not carried on, as in England, by the Church, in her regular course of ecclesiastical proceedings. The recognized authorities of the Church did not encourage the change at all, but still adhered to their old opinions. The Protestants, consequently, separated from the Church, and formed themselves into a new church on the Calvinistic foundation.

¹ Mosheim, Cent. xvi. c. iv. sect. i. § 12 12, note 4, Ed. Lond., 1845.

We must therefore decide that the adherents to the Romish Obedience, in Holland, were the Old Church, whether they were in the minority or the majority in point of numbers. And in that case, the Protestants were seceders, as they acknowledged themselves to be, setting up a rival sect within the actual jurisdiction of the Church which Christ and His Apostles had established fifteen hundred years before.

Finally—it does not appear that the Holland Missionaries came to this country for the purpose of building a Branch of the Church of Christ, on the broad Foundation laid by Christ and the Apostles. Their object was to establish the new Rule of Faith, adopted by the Holland seceders from that Church, and to extend the communion or church which they had formed on their own terms of communion. They neither took the Apostles' nor any one of the Creeds of the Universal Church for their Rule of Faith, nor did they manifest any serious regard for the acknowledged records, opinions and usages of the Primitive ages of the Church of Christ. But in all respects they regarded themselves as a new sect or church—based, indeed, upon the Bible—but still, as a church, a religious society—a visible community—they considered themselves as of an origin more recent than the commencement of the Reformation.

3. The German Reformed Church. The following account is taken from Dr. Mayer, *of York, Pa.*, in Rupp's Collection.

“The German Reformed Church, as its name imports, comprises the portion of the family of reformed

churches which speak the German language, and their descendants, and as such is distinguished from the French Reformed, the Dutch Reformed, etc. The founder of this church was Ulric Zwingli, a native of Switzerland. After the death of Zwingli and Œcolompadius in 1531, none of their associates enjoyed so decided a superiority over his brethren as to give him a commanding influence over the whole church, and to secure to him the chief direction of her councils. This honor was reserved for John Calvin, *the French Reformer*.

Thus the reformed church was established at Geneva, in 1541, with Calvin at its head.

“The German Reformed Church in the United States was founded by emigrants from Germany and Switzerland. Its origin may be dated about the year 1740, or rather somewhat earlier. The principal seat of the church in its infancy was eastern Pennsylvania, though settlements were made also, and congregations formed, at an earlier period in other States, particularly in the Carolinas, Virginia, Maryland, New Jersey and New York.

The *Heidelberg Catechism* is their Rule of Faith.

It is perfectly evident, from the foregoing account of the German Reformed Church, that it does not fulfill the conditions requisite to constitute a Branch of that Church which has existed since our Lord was on earth. It was established in this country by members of the German Reformed Church in Germany and Switzerland, and that church, as Dr. Mayer ingenuously confesses, *was founded* by Ulric Zwingle, of se-

ceders from the Church that existed in those countries before his day.

Mosheim says the same thing of them :

“The founder of the Reformed Church was *Ulrich Zwingli*, a Swiss, an acute man, and a lover of truth.”¹

As at Zurich, so at Geneva and elsewhere, therefore the German Reformed Church was made up of those who seceded from the Church, rejecting its regular and acknowledged authorities—retiring from its congregations to form new ones of their own, taking a new name and proceeding in a new manner altogether, whilst the old Church continued its functions and ministrations as before. They were, therefore, merely a sect of seceders, and no part of that visible society that had existed from the days of the Apostles. And therefore, although they might, and did—as history proves—extend *their* church into America, and other countries, yet the *Church of Christ*, whose visible communion they had left, they were entirely incapable of extending until they should return to its communion.

Nor, even in this, let any one suppose that I am saying of them what they did not admit to be true of themselves. Thus, Calvin, the very highest authority among them, said, “I know how great are our deficiencies [in an ecclesiastical point of view,] and certainly, if God should call us this day to an account, it would be difficult for us to make an excuse” [*difficilis esset excusatio*]. Viret says the same: “Many things are yet necessary for us in order that we may have the full regimen of the Church.” Calvin, also, in his

¹ Cent. xvi, Sect. iii, c. ii, § 3.

reply to *Cardinal Sadolet*, says, in behalf of himself and his German Reformed Church, "We do not deny that we are destitute of the regimen which the ancient Church had." Beza, Calvin's successor, said, "Think not that we wish to abolish that which is eternal, to wit, the Church of God. Think not that we search after arguments by which to depress you to this *our* wretched and vile condition." Writing to Archbishop Grindal, of England, he says, "that we are as yet far from what we ought to be, we willingly confess." The context shows beyond a question that he referred to their ecclesiastical position.

The son of Peter Du Moulin, another of their distinguished writers, says: "But the generous and illuminate souls make no difficulty to acknowledge openly the scantiness of their church government, and that their bed is shorter than that they can stretch themselves on it, and their covering narrower than that they can wrap themselves in it. But as short and narrow as it is, they must keep it by an invincible necessity." He also says, that so far as "ecclesiastical power [power to do anything as a church] is concerned, it is a perfect interregnum," *i. e.*, there is none. In addition, I will only refer to the fact that Calvin himself made application to the Church of England, to ordain him Bishop, and thus constitute him and his followers, a Branch of the Church at Geneva, founded by the English Branch of the Church. The application was intercepted by Romanists. But it is in itself a confession of the truth of all that I have said or need to say for our present purpose of the defects of the German Reformed Church.

4. Evangelical Lutherans. The name officially adopted by the Lutheran reformers was the "Evangelical Church."

"As Germany was the cradle of the Reformation, she was also the primitive seat of that church which grew out of the Reformation in the land of Luther. The Germans, after they had thrown off the yoke of Rome, through the instrumentality of their countryman Luther, and others, *constituted themselves* a reformed evangelical church which has been denominated Lutheran." The Elector of Saxony early instituted measures by which the Lutheran religion was established throughout his dominions. The treaty of *Passau* 1552, in which the Elector gained some important concessions from the Emperor Charles V., after the surprise at *Inspruck*, is regarded by the Lutherans as the basis of their religious freedom. A Diet assembled at Augsburg, 1555, declared that all who adopted the Augsburg confession [all Lutherans] should for the future be considered entirely free from the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, and from the authority and supervision of the Bishops (who retained their allegiance to Rome), that all the inhabitants of the German Empire should be allowed to judge for themselves, and to join the church whose doctrine and worship they thought most pure and Scriptural—*i. e.*, the old or the new.

This sect presents to our consideration substantially the same state of facts as the one last reviewed. The movement was commenced by an individual in the Diocese of Brandenburg, soon gained the favor of the

secular arm in the person of the Elector of Saxony, and the seceders became established as a new sect; the Church still continuing (though of course diminished in numbers by the secessions), in the full performance of its functions as before.

“It was from the church thus reformed, indoctrinated and established, that the German Lutheran Christians in the United States descended. After the establishment of the Lutheran church in Germany by the labors of Luther, Melancthon and others, about 1545, the Lutheran doctrines were extensively diffused and adopted. The earliest settlement of Lutherans in this country was made by emigrants from Holland to New York soon after the first establishment of the Dutch in that city, 1621. To this settlement succeeded that of the Swedes on the Delaware in 1636. The third settlement of the Lutherans in this country, was that of the Germans which gradually spread over Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, the interior of New York, and the Western States. The year 1820 has been mentioned as the date of the formation of the General Synod of the American Lutheran Church.— (*Chiefly from the Article in Rupp.*)

The *Augsburg Confession* is the Rule of Faith for the Evangelical Lutherans.

I might also quote a list of confessions of deficiency and destitution of what they considered essential to the Ministry and Sacraments of the Church by the founders of the Lutheran sect, similar to those I have quoted from the founders of the German Reformed. But it is not necessary to take up the time and room to repeat them.

5. The Mennonites. This sect is probably to be regarded as more nearly the descendants and representatives of the Albigenses or Waldenses than any other now in existence.

"The Mennonites fully acknowledge that they derive their name from Menno Simon, a native of Witmarsum, born in Friesland, A. D. 1495. In 1530 he was induced to examine the New Testament for himself, and his views were materially changed. He now commenced to travel with a view to consult some of his cotemporaries, such as Luther, Bucer, Bullinger and others. He distinctly repudiated the extravagances of the *Munsterites* or *Anabaptists*, yet assumed among them, at their earnest solicitation, the rank and functions of a public teacher. In 1537 he commenced traveling among the Anabaptists, or descendants of the ancient Waldenses all of whom were as scattered sheep of the House of Israel. He visited East and West Friesland, the province of Groningen, and then went to Holland, Guilderland, Brabant, Westphalia, and continued through the German Provinces that lie on the coast of the Baltic Sea, and penetrated as far as Livonia. In these places his ministerial labors were attended with remarkable success, and added a prodigious number of followers."

Now in all these countries the Church was established, but Menno allied himself with those who were out of its communion. Whether he found them already organized as sects, or organized them himself, or left them unorganized, it is immaterial so far as their identity with the Church is concerned.

His object, says his historian, Christian Herr, of *Pequa*, who was a bishop of the Mennonite Church, "was reformation and spiritual edification of his fellow men. He purified the doctrines of the Anabaptists—he retained some of them, and he excluded others who were tainted with the *Munsterite* heresy. He founded many communities in various parts of Europe."

Thus we see that he was a reformer *amongst the Anabaptists*, a body totally distinct in all its visible relations and connections from the Church which we are seeking to identify.

"From the year 1537 the Mennonites suffered great persecutions in Europe. They were compelled to flee from one country to another. Many came to Pennsylvania as early as 1783. Before 1735 there were probably rising of five hundred families in Lancaster county, Pa. In 1727 they translated and published their confession of faith.

6. The Methodists. The following account is abridged from the Rev. Dr. Bangs, of New York :

"The well-known founder of Methodism, under God, was the Rev. John Wesley, a presbyter of the Church of England, who, after his own conversion, set out with a simple desire to revive pure and undefiled religion in the Church of which he was a member and a minister."

Dr. Bangs has not given an account of the occasion and rise of Methodism in England, I will, therefore, interrupt his narrative to speak of it somewhat.

From the Revolution in England, 1688, in consequence of important changes in the ecclesiastical man-

agement, there commenced a rapid and sad decline in the state of religion in the English Church. Daily Prayer, from being neglected and omitted, came to be regarded as not at all obligatory—unnecessary, and even superstitious. The Church's holy seasons for Prayer, Fasting and Repentance, were neglected. The Holy Communion was less and less frequently administered, and in some cases it was celebrated only on the three times in the year required by the law of the land. Discipline was relaxed and worldly indifference was the prevailing characteristic. Wesley and a few others combined for the purposes of greater piety and a more faithful use of the means of grace pointed out for her members by the English Church. This procured for them the name of *Methodists*, which the sect that grew out of the movement still retain. In 1738 he visited Germany, and on his return he commenced those systematic labors which resulted in the foundation of his sect. The foundation of separate congregations in England is commonly assigned to 1739.

“The Methodist society in America was established in the city of New York, in the year 1766. A few pious emigrants from Ireland, who previously to their removal had been members of the Methodist society in their own country, landed in this city. Among their number was Mr. *Philip Embury*, their local preacher. This party soon became very dissolute in their morals, until a pious woman went into the room where they were assembled—seized the cards with which they were playing and threw them into the fire. She turned to Mr. Embury and said that he must

preach to them. And accordingly he preached his first sermon in his own hired house to five persons only. This, it is believed, was the first Methodist sermon ever preached in America, October 30, 1768.

"In 1784, we come to an important era in the history of this sect. Up to this time their preachers had been considered as laymen having no authority to administer the ordinances, and hence the members of the societies had been dependent upon other ministers for the rite of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In 1770, to avoid this difficulty, some of the southern preachers had begun to ordain each other. Through the influence of Mr. Asbury this practice had been discontinued, and on the 2d of September, 1784, Mr. Wesley, assisted by other presbyters, consecrated Thomas Coke, LL.D., then a presbyter in the Church of England, as superintendent, and likewise ordained two others to the office of Elders, and sent them over to America, with instructions to organize the societies here into a separate and independent church, furnishing them with forms of ordination for deans [deacons?], elders and superintendents, for administering baptism, and the consecration and administration of the Lord's supper. At a Conference called for that purpose in Baltimore, December 25, 1784, the measures were unanimously approved. Dr. Coke was recognized in his character of Superintendent, and Mr. Asbury was elected to the same office, and consecrated by Dr. Coke, on the 27th of the same month. Several others were ordained deacons and elders at the same time."

The founders of the Methodist church in this country were men who had been, and were at that time, some of them, members of the English Church. Yet, in what they did, they did not act with the sanction of that Church; the society which they founded was not received into communion with the Church of England and never sought to be so received. It made no claims to be a branch of that Church. In the function of ordination which Mr. Wesley took upon himself to perform, he transcended the authority which in the view of the Church of England, he, as a Presbyterian, merely, possessed. Nor do even the men whom he ordained seem to have been satisfied with their ordination; for both Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury sought ordination from the American Bishops, Seabury of Connecticut, and White of Pennsylvania.¹

It is a singular fact, that as in the case of almost all the founders of the modern sects, they did not believe that they could, under the circumstances, found a society that should be a branch of the Church, so also it was in the case of Wesley.

Thus Wesley says: "At the first meeting of all our preachers in conference in June, 1744, I exhorted them to keep to the Church; observing that this was our peculiar glory—not to form any new sect, but abiding in our own Church, to do to all men all the good we possibly could.

"But as more dissenters joined us, many of whom were much prejudiced against the Church, these, with or without design, were continually infusing their own prejudices into their brethren.

¹ See Bishop White's Memoirs, p. 168.

"I saw this and gave warning of it from time to time both in private and in public, and in the year 1758 I resolved to bring the matter to a fair issue. So I desired the point might be considered at large whether it was expedient for the Methodists to leave the Church. The arguments on both sides were discussed for several days, and at length we agreed without a dissenting voice 'It is by no means expedient that the Methodists should leave the Church of England.' Nevertheless the same leaven continued to work in various parts of the kingdom."

In 1778 he says again: "The original Methodists are all of the Church of England, and the more awakened they were the more zealously they adhered to it in every point both of doctrine and discipline. Hence we inserted in the first Rules of our Society 'they that leave the Church, leave us.' And this we did, *not as a point of prudence, but a point of conscience.*"

He died March 2, 1791, and in 1789, two years before his death, he said: "I never had any design of separating from the Church; I have no such design now. I do not believe the Methodists in general design it when I am no more seen. I do, and will do all that is in my power to prevent such an event. Nevertheless in spite of all that I can do many will separate from it."

"In flat opposition to these, I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment or advice will ever separate from it."

In his sermon preached at Cork, about the same

time, he declared to the preachers in his connection that they had no right to baptize and administer the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. His design was to improve the state of religion *in* the Church. But, as he said, he did not dare to leave the Church, and on the Minutes of the Conference, in 1770, he had these emphatic words entered: "*Let this be well observed—I fear when the Methodists leave the Church, God will leave them.*"

7. The Moravians. Like that of the Mennonites and Baptists, the history of this sect is involved in a great deal of obscurity. Like them too, the Moravians refer to, and make use of the Waldenses, or Albigenses. From an article in Rupp's collection, which has the sanction of the Board of the Moravian Church, I make the following abridgment:

"United Brethren, or *Unitas Fratrum*, or sometimes called *Moravians*, were originally founded by the descendants of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, who being persecuted for their religious tenets and non-conformity in their native country, founded a colony under the patronage of Count Zinzendorf, on an estate of his called *Berthelsdorf*, in Upper Lusatia, in the year 1722, to which colony the name of '*Herrnhut*,' was given. No bond of union, however, existed for some time. But after a while, under the guidance of Count Zinzendorf, who from an early age had entertained an idea of constituting a Christian community, on the model of the primitive Apostolic congregation, certain articles of union were proposed among them. All the inhabitants of Herrnhut, after mature

consideration, adopted this scheme and these statutes by the name of a brotherly agreement, and pledged themselves mutually to its observance in the year 1727, and thus formed the first stock of the present Society of United Brethren. Count Zinzendorf was justly in some measure considered the founder of the society. Individuals from the Protestant denominations were, from the beginning, admitted among them without renouncing their original Church and creed. 'The United Brethren continue strenuously to object to being considered a separate sect or denomination, because their union is exclusively founded on general Christian doctrines and their peculiarities *relate solely to their social organization.*' Still, however, when called upon to point out their creed, they profess a general adherence to the Confession of Augsburg. The Society early undertook to propagate the Gospel among the heathen nations. In the prosecution of their object they planted colonies in different parts of Germany, England, Holland, America, etc., all of which together now constitute the Unity of the Brethren. Each *local congregation* is responsible to the General Board of the Directors, at present seated at Berthelsdorf, near Hernnhut."

Although the foregoing statements are copied from a document which had the approbation of the Board, I cannot but think that it comes short of what is claimed for them. I have before me another account, as follows :

"They derive their origin from the Greek Church in the ninth century, when by the instrumentality of

Methodius and *Cyrillus*, two Greek monks, the kings of Bulgaria and Moravia being converted to the Faith, were, together with their subjects, united in communion with the Greek Church. *Methodius* was their first Bishop, and for their use *Cyrillus* translated the Scriptures into the Slavonian language. The greater part of the members, in process of time, were compelled to submit to the See of Rome. A few of them joined the Waldenses, in 1170, and became identified with them. From this union of the Bohemian seceders and the Waldenses, arose the sect of *Moravians*."

The *Moravians* are Episcopalians. In 1467 three of their Preachers were ordained Bishops by a Waldensian Bishop in Austria, by the name of *Stephen*. These, on their return, ordained ten other Bishops. This occurred in Bohemia, where the Church was already established, and, consequently, this step was the organization of a distinct and opposing sect.

Mosheim says: "The *Bohemian Brethren*, as they are called, or *Moravians*, were descended from the better sort of *Hussites*, and at the Councils of Ostor, 1620, and 1627, the two communities of Bohemians and Swiss [*Hussites*], became consolidated into one which took the name of *the Church of the United Brethren*, and retained the *form* and *regulations* of the Bohemians, but embraced the *doctrines* of the Reformed." ¹

Notwithstanding all this uncertainty and diversity of opinion and statement concerning their origin, there is no uncertainty about the main point of our inquiry,

¹ Cent. xvi, sec. iii.

to wit, that the Moravians are a sect outside of the visible Society which has existed ever since the Ascension of our Lord.

It is pretty certain that Moravia had been (imperfectly, no doubt), converted, in a great measure, before Methodius and Cyrillus, the Greek Monks, went there, and that, too, by missionaries in the Roman Obedience. At all events, the Church in Moravia was soon brought into the Roman Obedience, and only the few seceders who joined the Waldenses, enter in as an element towards making up the modern sect of the Moravians.

We have already seen who and what the people called Waldensians were. The Hussites were also a sect of seceders (probably from the Diocese of Constance, in Switzerland), whom Huss had gathered around him. None of these things can give ecclesiastical character to them as a part of Christ's visible Church. They make no claim to such a position in the sense in which we are using the words, *i. e.*, to denote the visible society which has existed since his day.

In tracing any Branch of the Church it is always a proper and a profitable question to ask *where* it has existed: for the Church is necessarily connected with place. And hence, as we have more than once seen and said, each Branch takes its name from the place in which it existed and exercised its jurisdiction. The Moravian Church, when called by the name which its members prefer, has no such indication of locality. They call themselves United Brethren. But even

when we call them, or they call themselves Moravians, neither we nor they mean to indicate by that name that they are the Church of the Province of Moravia, which is in the Empire of Austria. The Church in that Province is now in the Roman Obedience, and has been for centuries. It never rejected the Papal Supremacy, as the Church of England had done.

8. The Presbyterians. We now come to the last in our list of the *Primary Sects*.

We have already examined, so far as our present undertaking requires, the ecclesiastical position of those who came to this country as "elements to the American Presbyterian church," from "the Reformed churches on the Continent," and after giving an account of its establishment here, we will proceed to an account of those that came from Scotland.

I shall take my account of the Presbyterians chiefly from the article of Dr. Krebs, *Permanent Clerk of the General Assembly*, in Rupp's Collection.

"The Presbyterian church in the United States derives its lineage from the Presbyterians, both in Ireland and Scotland. It is true that Presbyterianism was the form not only of the church of Scotland, but also of the Reformed churches on the continent of Europe, and indeed, of the Puritans of England about the time of the Westminster Assembly [1643]; and contributions from all these sources have been made at various times to the elements of the American Presbyterian Church.

"The primary ecclesiastical union of the American Presbyterians occurred in 1706 when the Presbytery

of Philadelphia was founded. At the meeting of the Synod in 1721 there was made a declaration that the Presbyterians in America had exercised the Presbyterian government and discipline according to the practice of 'the best reformed churches,' as far as the nature and constitution of this country would allow."

Dr. Miller, of *Princeton Theological Seminary*, New Jersey, in his *Encyclopedia of religious knowledge* says:

"This denomination is to be considered as the offspring of the church of Scotland."

Our attention is, therefore, in the first place, chiefly directed to Scotland.

The Church of Scotland was brought into the Roman Obedience about the beginning of the twelfth century, and so continued until the sixteenth. In 1555, John Knox, who is regarded as the great Scotch Reformer, returned from Geneva, in Switzerland, and added great vigor to the reformation which had already been begun. *The Bishops and ecclesiastical authorities generally opposed the movement.* The contest was carried on, on both sides, in a most unjustifiable spirit. The civil authorities were called into requisition by both parties, as it was found possible to make use of them. In 1558 the reforming party in the Parliament described themselves as "*the Nobility and Commons of the Protestants of the Church of Scotland.*"¹ In 1560, the Parliament published by their authority, "the Confession of Faith professed and believed by the Protestants

¹ Lawson's Hist. of the Episcopal Church of Scotland from the Reformation to the Revolution, p. 41.

within the realm of Scotland." This confession was confirmed by the three estates in Parliament on the 17th of August, and on the 24th of the same month, the jurisdiction of the Pope was abolished by the same authority. The Bishops and Clergy who were in Parliament seem to have acquiesced in this proceeding, though they did not approve of it. They lived and died for the most part Papists. On the 20th of December in the same year, "the Protestants of the Church of Scotland" held their first General Assembly. It consisted of *forty-six* persons, of whom Knox was the principal. They commenced operations as an organized sect about this time, being as yet, of course, only a small minority, and in opposition to the Church and its Clergy generally.

Thus things went on; the Protestants gaining in numbers and influence. Some of the Bishops joined them—as for instance, the Bishops of Galloway, Orkney, Caithness and Argyll. Some of the Bishoprics soon became vacant by death or otherwise, and in 1572, a Convocation was held at *Lieth* in which some very important steps were taken. It was not thought expedient, however, to alter the titles of the Archbishops and Bishops, nor the bounds of the Dioceses, but that they should stand and continue as before the Reformation. Some of the old Bishops had conformed, and the places of the others were now filled, without regular and canonical ordination, however, with Protestants.

This constituted what was called a *Tulchan* Episcopacy—a term derived, as Lawson says, from a prac-

tice then prevalent, of stuffing a calf's skin with straw, and placing it before a cow to induce the animal to give milk, which figure was called a "*tulchan*"—a term derived from a word signifying a model, or close resemblance.

From this time [1572] the Clergy in the Roman Obedience ceased to claim or exercise jurisdiction or ministerial functions in the Church of Scotland.

This "*Tulchan*" Episcopacy continued until 1610. In 1607 James I, King of England, and VIth of Scotland, summoned a General Assembly of the Scotch church to be held at *Dundee* on the 24th of November. Each of the Presbyteries was required to send "two of the most godly, peaceable, wise and grave" of their number, as their representatives. A conference was also held at Falkland, in Fife, in June, 1608, and a General Assembly again in Dundee, on the 26th of July of the same year. In all of these meetings, progress was made towards the settlement of the state of affairs in the Church, in a more satisfactory manner. In 1610 three of those persons who were actually in possession of the Sees, or had been nominated to those that were vacant, Spottiswoode, Archbishop of Glasgow, Lamb, Bishop of Brechin, and Hamilton, Bishop of Galloway, went to London and were ordained Bishops by the Bishops of the English Church. They returned home and consecrated the others, who either were in possession of, or had been appointed to the vacant Sees.

Thus the Church became again, in fact, as well as in name and form, Episcopal.

In 1754,¹ Andrew Melville returned from a ten years' residence in Geneva, and if he was not the first to introduce a preference for the Presbyterian form of church government, he certainly added great vigor to the zeal of those who entertained such a preference. His party continued to increase until 1637, when they combined and drove those of the Episcopal Clergy, who would not submit to the Presbyterian rule, out of their places in the Church.

The establishment of Presbyterianism at this period, was no act of the Church. The General Assembly—which met at Glasgow, November 17, 1638—consisted, according to the laws of the Church and the Realm, of the King's Commissioner (at that time the Marquis of Hamilton), the Bishops, and inferior clergy and laity as Delegates. The King's Commissioner was acknowledged to have the right to dissolve the Assembly. Such an Assembly was the highest ecclesiastical authority in Scotland, the only one that could make any change or regulation of any kind in the Church. But on the 21st of November, before any business had been transacted, the Bishops protested against the Assembly and refused to have anything to do with it, on the ground of illegality in the election of the Deputies, and for other reasons. This protest or "*Declinature*" as it was called, occasioned a good deal of discussion—the Marquis taking sides with the Bishops. On the 29th he dissolved the Assembly and withdrew. Episcopacy was abolished and Presbyterianism established by this *remainder* of a General

¹ Lawson's Hist. as before, p. 131.

Assembly—after the Protest or Declinature of the Bishops—after the withdrawal of the Lord High Commissioner—and after, therefore, the Dissolution of the Assembly by what it had hitherto acknowledged a competent authority, and according to its own rules and laws.¹

But on the Restoration of King Charles II, to the throne of England, in 1660, steps were taken to bring back those of the Episcopal Clergy that survived, to their places in the Church in Scotland, as well as in England. On the 15th of December, 1661, four persons were consecrated, for the Scottish Sees, and they, on their return home, filled up, by consecration, the other Sees as before 1637. *Sydserf*, of Galloway, the only Scotch Bishop that survived the Rebellion and remained faithful to the Church, was transferred to the See of Orkney. The four new Bishops were *James Sharp*, Archbishop of St. Andrews, *Andrew Fairfoul*, Archbishop of Glasgow, *James Hamilton*, Bishop of Galloway, and *Robert Leighton*, for Dumblane.

Thus again was the Episcopacy restored to the Church of Scotland. It appears from the testimony of the Earl of Glencairn, that the Episcopalians were six to one.² The Presbyterians, who were now excluded from its Ministry and its Churches, had, many of them, settled in Ireland, some came to America, and many remained at home as a sect in opposition to the Church.

But the act which has led the Presbyterians in this country to call the Presbyterians in Scotland "*the*

¹ Lawson, pp. 571-590.

² Lawson, p. 671.

Church of Scotland," is of a subsequent date, and remains yet to be related.

In 1688, occurred a change in the English Dynasty. James II, the last of the line of the Stuarts, left the kingdom, and William, Prince of Orange, the husband of the eldest daughter of the King, came to the Throne. James, however, had a son, who, according to the laws of England, and the oaths of all in office in the realm, was the legitimate heir to the crown. The Scotch Bishops and Clergy generally, adhered to James and his son. The Presbyterians, on the other hand, readily yielded their support to William. In an interview between Compton, Bishop of London, and Rose, Bishop of Edinburgh, Compton said to Rose that William was satisfied that "the great body of the nobility and gentry of Scotland were for the Episcopacy, and that he had directed him [Compton], to say that if the Episcopalians of Scotland would undertake to serve him to the purpose that he is served in England, he would take them by the hand, support the Church and Order, and throw off the Presbyterians."¹

The Presbyterians had kept alive their animosities towards the Church, from the time of Melville's return. Their feelings had been much embittered by the proceedings of the Churchmen, after the Restoration: and they were ready to avail themselves of every advantage in their favor that might present itself. William, after his recognition as king, took the rev-

¹ Lathbury's Hist. of the Non Jurors, p. 416, where this testimony as to the comparative numbers, etc., of the Churchmen and the Presbyterians, is abundantly sustained.

venues of the Scotch Bishops and put them into his pocket, by an order published October 19, 1689.¹ Ever since that time these revenues have been paid into the Royal Exchequer.² An act, passed in the Scotch Parliament, through the King's influence, on the 24th of April, 1690, gave to the *Presbyterian Seceders* the possession and control of the Church edifices and property; and on the 7th of June following, the Westminster Confession of Faith was declared, by *the same authority*, to be the allowed and established Confession of Faith in Scotland, and the Presbyterian Church-government and Discipline "established, ratified and confirmed."³

The Bishops and Clergy, however, continued their ministrations entirely distinct from the Presbyterians, as before, as far as the tyranny of the laws and the violence of Presbyterian intolerance would permit. A large portion of the people still adhered to their communion—and thus the identity of the Church of Scotland was preserved by them, notwithstanding the disestablishment and the violence that was brought to bear against it.

"The first Presbyterian church that was organized and furnished with a place of worship in this country," says Dr. Miller, "was about 1703." Their first presbytery was organized in 1704. But neither the Church of Scotland nor the Sect which is by law entitled to

¹ Lawson's History of the Church of Scotland since the Revolution, p. 100.

² Lawson's Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland, pp. 103-105.

³ Lawson's Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland, pp. 103-105.

that name, appear to have had anything to do with it. The agents in its formation were indeed chiefly of Scotch descent. But they were neither members of of the Scotch Church when they came to this country, nor admitted to its communion afterwards.

When, therefore, the Presbyterians say that the Presbyterian church in America was founded by the Church of Scotland, they mean that it was founded by Presbyterian seceders from the Scotch Church, who, since their establishment by the State, have been called "the Church of Scotland."

It is not true, therefore, in the sense required by the essential principles of the identity of the Church, that the Presbyterian church in this country was established by the Church of Scotland.

If we turn our attention to Ireland, we find the same general state of facts. In 1537 the Papal jurisdiction was abolished by Parliament and the Bishops, Clergy, and whole Church generally assented to the Reformation. In the reign of Mary, the Papist, five of the Irish Bishops who would not conform to the Roman Obedience, were expelled from their Sees. When, in 1560, the Reformation was restored, seventeen out of nineteen Bishops in Parliament approved it, and the rest of the Bishops and clergy generally, as well as the people acquiesced. But Presbyterianism was never established in the Church of Ireland. The Presbyterians were always, whenever there were any, seceders from the Church, so confessedly and nominally, as well as in fact.

The Presbyterians are certainly very shrewd, if

not altogether wise, in referring to Scotland for their pedigree of descent. The facts permit, if not an argument, yet an obscuration of the subject, in the midst of which men of only ordinary sagacity are in danger of getting so bewildered as not to know what to think or believe.

Let us now turn our attention to England, which is really the nation and home of the denomination.

When the Presbyterians gained the ascendancy in the English Parliament, 1643, they appointed the famous Westminster Assembly of Divines—to provide for a change in religion. In consequence, Episcopacy and the Prayer Book were abolished—so far as the authority of Parliament could effect such a result, and Presbyterianism established instead. The Independents petitioned for toleration, and a correspondence ensued. From Collier's *History of Great Britain*, I make the following quotations:¹

“That the toleration which the Independents asked could not be granted as it would ‘be licensing perpetual division in the church;’ that ‘the request supposes the lawfulness of gathering churches out of true churches—in countenance of which there is not the least example in all the Holy Scriptures;’ that ‘if the Church requires that which is evil of any member, he must forbear compliance, but yet without separation;’ that though tenderness of conscience may oblige to forbear or suspend the act of communion in a case scrupled and supposed unlawful; yet it does not bind people to a practice repugnant to the will of God; of

¹ Vol. VIII, p. 297-302.

which kind they conceive the gathering separate churches out of true churches to be an instance ;' that 'the notion of separation is not to be determined by civil legislature, nor by acts of state, but by the word of God,' 'the same ground of separation may be pleaded by any erroneous conscience whatever, and thus by the same equity and parity of reasoning the Church may be broken into as many subdivisions as there are different scruples in the minds of men,' and in this new shelter, the same danger may be apprehended and carry the scrupling persons to a further distance. And are these subdivisions and fractions in church government as lawful as they may be infinite ? Or must we give that regard to erroneous consciences as to satisfy men's scruples by so unbounded a liberty ? Does not this plainly import that *error in conscience* is a protection against [the guilt of] schism.' 'Scruple of conscience is no good plea against the charge of schism, the motives must have more weight in them.'"

Such is the language used, and the views held by the men who composed the Westminster Assembly—of whose *Confession of Faith and Catechism*, Dr. Krebs, "*Permanent Clerk*," etc., says that they "always have been the *only standard* [!] of Faith, Rites, Government and Discipline of the Presbyterians of this country."

I do not intend to adopt this language altogether—or to make an indiscriminate application of it. But it states with great plainness several points—(1) that the Scriptures do not allow of the gathering of a church out of one that is already established, that is, establishing a second, where there is already one—(2) that the

civil authority or "acts of the state" can give no authority or be any justification for so doing, the matter being exclusively of a religious character—(3) that error and evil in a Church is no justification of separation, though it may be necessary to refuse compliance in particular acts—(4) that in as much as conscience may be erroneous and corrupt, *its* scruples alone are no sufficient plea or excuse for an act of separation—and (5) that therefore, there can be no justification for a separation from a Church that is truly a Branch of the Church of Christ.

So thought and taught the Presbyterians when they had got, or supposed they had, the ascendancy in a legitimate branch of the Church of Christ. Their whole and sole authority, however, for legislating in the court had been derived from Parliament, and by a violent expulsion of legitimate members.

And this is in the main, sound reasoning. When the Presbyterians used it, they supposed they occupied the position which the Church of England now occupies—that is, the position of a valid Branch of the Church, historically connected with the past, which could be identified with the main Body. The reasoning which they then used for their own advantage, as they supposed, if it is now turned against them, completely cuts off their claim.

In considering these Sects, I have avoided a statement of their doctrines and constitution except in so far as some allusion to them came in incidentally. But of them all it may be said :

1. That no one of them has the Ministry which our

Lord instituted, continued and perpetuated in the way which has always, in the Church, been esteemed essential to its identity.

2. That no one of them is based upon the Creed of the Primitive Church, or professes to hold to it as their Rule of Faith, but each of them has a Rule of its own, and peculiar to itself.

3. That they all have been organized not by, or with the consent and approbation of the Church in which their founders were members, but always and in all cases within the jurisdiction of that Church, and in opposition to its laws and authority.

4. That no one of them has ever been recognized as a Branch of the Church of Christ by any Church which has existed from the Apostles' days, or any that has been planted by such an Apostolic Church. But they have always regarded themselves, and have been regarded by others as constituting a communion, or perhaps several, by themselves, which has arisen into being since the commencement of the Reformation.

I have no disposition to call in question the piety or motives of those who have been instrumental in laying the foundations of these sects. On the contrary I had much rather dwell upon the excuses and apologies for their error—which are to be found in the times and circumstances of their lives. The abuses and evils in the Church were great, and the influence of the preceding centuries had, perhaps on the whole, been calculated to produce views of the organization and discipline of the Church, more completely erro-

neous than of the doctrines of the Gospel. The reformers of whom we have been speaking felt deeply the evils under which they were suffering. But they saw no clear way of escape. Unlike the English Reformers, the Church and ecclesiastical authorities with which, by the Providence of God, they were connected, were against them. They considered themselves called upon to bear their testimony against the evils and corruptions of their day. In this we certainly cannot consider them in the wrong. And it is now impossible to say what might have been the result if they had pursued a course not less firm and faithful, but more meek and conciliatory. The truth has a power and vitality of its own, in all cases. But religious truth is especially the object of Divine care. If they had simply borne their testimony and submitted to whatever might have been inflicted upon them, the good seed might, and probably would, have taken deeper root, and sprung up to a more widespread growth, and Germany, instead of being, as it is, overrun with pantheism, rationalism, and infidelity, would probably have presented us with a Protestant Church, sound in the faith, unblamable in life, and embracing the great mass of the population.

But to human foresight—for man sees not as God seeth—it seemed that without some association or combination amongst themselves, their influence would be greatly circumscribed, and, perhaps, wholly counteracted and lost to the world. Therefore, they organized into churches, formed rules of faith for themselves, and undertook to perform ecclesiastical func-

tions; and putting their trust in him, whose prerogative it is to bring good out of evil, they relied upon the necessities of the case for their justification in what they were doing.

With this, however, we are not now to concern ourselves. We have ascertained the fact that they are not parts of that visible and continuous Church which Christ and the Apostles founded—this they did not claim to be, and that is all that we need now to ascertain concerning them.

SECONDARY SECTS.—These, it will be remembered, are those that have split off from some one of the Primary Sects.

Secessions from the Presbyterians.

1. The Congregationalists. I shall treat the Congregationalists as a secondary sect or denomination, for the reason that the majority of the early Congregationalists had been Presbyterians.

“The origin of the Congregationalists as a modern sect is commonly ascribed to Robert Brown, who organized a Church in England in 1583.”

Brown's Church, however, seems to have come to naught, and many—perhaps a majority of the early Puritans or non-conformists—were Presbyterians in principle.

“But about the commencement of the seventeenth century appeared *John Robinson*, who has, not inappropriately, been called the Father of modern Congregationalism. We first hear of him as a pastor of a church which had been formed in the north of England, in the year previous to Elizabeth's death [March,

1603]. But not finding things to their mind in England, they left for Holland, in 1608, and Mr. Robinson soon followed. 'Mr. Robinson and his congregation, upon their arrival in Holland, first joined themselves to the church at Amsterdam [Dutch Reformed]; but owing to the dissensions that had broken out among its members, at the end of a year they removed to Leyden. In the year 1617, Mr. Robinson and his church began to think of a removal to America. Robinson remained with the majority at Leyden, and Elder Brewster accompanied the emigrants.' They arrived at Plymouth, Mass., 1620."

At first the Congregationalists gathered their congregations within the bosom of the Church of England, then they went to Holland, and, failing to gain their object there, obtained a grant of a large tract of land in America, and came hither to settle.

Of course there is no pretense that these Pilgrims were the Church of England.

Mr. Robinson "at the commencement of his ministry among the separatists, in common with Brown, denounced that Church, as *essentially anti-Christian*, and would neither regard her members as brethren, nor hear ministers preach."

This, we are to remember, was after the Reformation—after the Church of England had adopted the Apostles' Creed, as her Rule of Faith; after the adoption of the xxxix Articles as the standard of her teaching on all points included in them.

The Chief complaints of the Congregationalists, or Puritans, against the Presbyterians, was the use of

clerical garments, certain abuses of plurality, and general laxity of discipline.

2. Associate Presbyterian Church in North America. This is a branch of the Church of Scotland [the Presbyterians], and holds the doctrines of the Westminster Assembly. It was formed in 1733. In consequence of the recognition of the Presbyterians as the Establishment in Scotland by William and Mary, in 1688, a law was passed in 1712, giving the right of patronage and presentment to lay proprietors. This led to a secession in 1733, and the seceders took the title above written.¹

3. Reformed Presbyterian Church. This sect also is formed of persons who seceded from the Scotch Presbyterians in 1688, in consequence of their consenting to become the Establishment, and be supported by law. They were organized into a Sect in this country in 1798.²

4. Associate Reformed Church. Between 1660 and 1688, a large number [3,000 *Wodrow*] of Presbyterians were brought to this country from Scotland, and sold for slaves, chiefly in Virginia, Pennsylvania and New Jersey. The first steps toward organization into a Church, were taken in 1736, by the *Associate Presbyterian Church, etc.* In 1751 they received a minister from the *Reformed Presbyterian Church*, and in 1774 they received two more. In 1782 they became a fully organized Sect. Efforts have been made to unite them with the two Sects just named, derived from the

¹ Rev. W. I. Cleland, and Rev. James P. Miller.

² The Rev. John N. McLeod, D.D., N. Y.

Scotch Presbyterians, but they have hitherto been un-availing.¹

5. Cumberland Presbyterians. This Sect was founded in 1796, by the Rev. James McGready. It originated chiefly in an effort for a revival in Kentucky. It resulted in the formation of the Sect in 1802. A General Assembly was formed in 1829.²

Secessions from the Baptists.

1. Freewill Baptists. This connection was founded in 1780. The first Baptist Church was of general views, and the Baptists in several of the States were Armenian long before the Freewill Baptist connection arose. In 1780, this portion, being in the minority, seceded.³

2. Seventh-Day Baptists. In 1665, a Seventh-Day Baptist came from England, and in 1681 he and his followers came to an open separation from the Baptist Church, on the ground, as their name indicates, of their preferring the *seventh* day of the week for their Sabbath.⁴

3. Disciples of Christ. These are sometimes called "Reformed Baptist" and "Campbellites." This Sect was chiefly founded by Mr. James Campbell, who had been a Minister in the "Secession" branch of the

¹Rev. John Forsyth, D.D., Professor in the Seminary at Newburg, N. Y.

²Rev. Dr. Beard, President of the Cumberland College, Princeton, Ky.

³Rev. Porter S. Burbank.

⁴Rev. W. B. Gillett, Pastor of the Seventh-Day Baptist Church, Piscataway, N. J.

Scotch Presbyterians. He and his followers were baptized again by immersion in 1812. In 1813 they were received into communion with the regular Baptists. But soon after they separated again.¹

Secession from the Mennonites.

1. Reformed Mennonites. This Sect commenced in 1811, when certain members of the Mennonite connection, deploring the general decline in the piety of their Sect, commenced a reformation. They do not deem themselves at liberty to keep an accurate account of their members.²

2. German Baptists or Brethren. This Sect are often called "Dunkers." They came to this country from Germany, in 1718-1730.³

3. Seventh-Day German Baptists. This Sect is an offshoot from the foregoing under the leading of Conrad Beissel, in 1728.⁴

4. Amish or Omish Church. This is a Sect of the Mennonites, separated from the rest chiefly on the ground of being more strict in their dress and discipline. They are sometimes called "*Hook*" Mennonites," while the others are called "*Button*" Mennonites.⁵

Secessions from the German Reformed Church.

The Church of God. In 1820, the Rev. John Winebrenner commenced a revival in Harrisburg, Pa.,

¹ Rev. R. Richardson, of Va.

² Rev. John Herr, Strasburg, one of their Bishops.

³ Rev. Philip Boyle, Uniontown, Md.

⁴ Dr. Wm. H. Fahnstock.

⁵ Shem Zook.

which extended to some distance around. His movement was disapproved by the German Reformed authorities, and led to a separation, and the formation of a new Sect, with the title above given.¹

The Secessions from the Methodists.

1. The Methodist Society. This Society was first composed of a number of members seceding from the Methodist Episcopal Church in the city of New York, in the year 1820, together with several of their trustees. It had its origin in the ruling elder's insisting on receiving the money collected in the different churches under his charge, through stewards of his own appointment, instead of the usual and lawful way. They have three Conferences.²

2. Methodist Protestant Church. This Sect was organized in 1830. It consists mostly of seceders from the Methodist Episcopal Church "on account of her government and hostility to lay representation."³

3. Reformed Methodist Church. This Sect took its origin from a feeble secession from the Methodist Episcopal Church in Vermont, 1814. They believe in "the attainableness of entire sanctification in this life."⁴

4. The True Wesleyan Methodist Church. This Society was organized in 1843. It consists of seceders from the original Sect, and from the Methodist Protestants. They united for the purpose of having

¹ Winebrenner, V. D. M.

² Rev. W. M. Stillwell.

³ Rev. J. R. Williams, of Baltimore.

⁴ Rev. Wesley Bailey, Utica, N. Y.

“churches free from Episcopacy, Intemperance and Slavery.”¹

This completes the list of Secondary Sects, as it was in 1849, and I have not thought it worth while, for my present purposes, to bring it down to our time.

THE AUTOTHENTIC SECTS. Under this head I include those sects which can hardly be called branches or offshoots from any of the preceding ones: but which are rather the organized body of the followers of some one or more influential individuals gathered from many sects, perhaps, and composed in a measure of those that had not previously belonged to any sect or profession of religion.

1. Christians. It is claimed for this sect that they do not owe their origin to any one man. They arose nearly simultaneously in different sections of the country. In N. C. James O’Kelly and several other preachers seceded from the Methodists on account of some disagreement in regard to their church government. In Vermont Abner Jones, among the Baptists, commenced to preach against creeds and sectarian names, and gathered a church in 1800. About the same time a number of Presbyterians, in Kentucky and Tennessee, began to entertain similar views, and Barton W. Stone, with several others, seceded. They are not Trinitarians, reject infant baptism and baptize by immersion.²

2. The Evangelical Association. In 1796 Jacob Albright began to preach among the Germans “among

¹ Rev. J. Timberman, Pastor, etc., N. Y.

² Rev. David Millard.

whom at this time Christianity was at a very low ebb." He was quite successful, and in 1800 his followers formed themselves into an association; and in 1803 they introduced among themselves "an ecclesiastical regulation." "Albright was chosen presiding Elder among them, and duly confirmed by the other preachers, and ordained by their laying on of hands, so as to authorize him to perform all transactions that are necessary for a Christian Society, and becoming to an evangelical preacher."¹

3. Schwenkfelders. This sect was founded by Caspar Schwenkfeld Van Ossing of Silesia. A number of them came to Pennsylvania in 1734. They have a peculiar custom of calling their minister to pray over and for infants instead of baptizing them. They invert the words of the institution of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper (This is My Body) and say, My Body is this—that is, such as is this bread which is broken for you, etc.²

4. Unitarians. Unitarian sentiments made their appearance very early among the descendants of the Puritans in New England. In 1815 a new impulse was given to the subject by the publication of Belsham's *Life of Lindsey*. A controversy was commenced, which led to an open separation between the two parts of the Congregational church.³

5. Universalists. This sect was chiefly founded by John Murray and Elhanan Winchester, from 1775 to 1780. Their first convention was held in 1785. They

¹ Rev. W. W. Orwig.

² Dr. Lamson, of Dedham, Mass.

³ Isaac Schultz.

believe that all retribution or punishment is confined to this world.¹

6. Restorationists. This sect split off from the Universalists in 1831, on account of the original sect declaring against any punishment or opportunity for repentance in a future world.²

7. United Brethren in Christ. This denomination took its rise in the United States about 1755, and is distinguished from the Old United Brethren or Moravians by the additional phrase "*in Christ.*" The founder was Wm. Otterbein. The sect bears many points of resemblance to the Methodists, though gathered chiefly from among the Germans.³

8. Second Advent Believers. This sect was commenced by Wm. Miller, who began to lecture in 1831. They are distinguished by their view of the socond Advent and their belief that the present dispensation and orders of things in the world will soon come to an end. They have already fixed upon several dates which have not realized their expectations.⁴

Sects which claim some Special Revelation or Inspiration, besides that received through the Bible.

1. Friends or Quakers. This sect was founded by George Fox, He commenced his labors in 1647, in England. About 1655 some of this people arrived in America. They discard a Ministry, Sacraments,

¹ Rev. A. B. Grosh.

² Hon. Charles Hudson.

³ Rev. Wm. Hanby:

⁴ Most of these facts are taken from N. Southard, editor of the *Midnight Cry*.

and outward Forms generally. Without discarding the Scriptures altogether, they believe in an "*inner light*" or "*a Spirit within*," which is recognized as the principal guide in divine things.¹

2. Friends (*Hicksites*). This society was founded by a secession from the foregoing in 1837. The cause of the division was doctrinal differences in opinion.

3. Shakers. This sect was founded by the French Prophets in Dauphiny and Cervennes, in France, about 1788. In a few years several hundred Protestants professed to be inspired; their bodies were much agitated with various operations; when they received the spirit of prophecy they trembled, staggered and fell down, and lay as if they were dead. They recovered, twitching, shaking and crying to God for mercy for themselves and all mankind. Three of their most distinguished prophets came to London about 1705. In 1772 the society residing in Lancashire, England, received a revelation from God to repair to America. They arrived in New York in 1774.²

4. New Jerusalem, or New Christian Church. This sect was founded by Emanuel Swedenborg, who commenced his labors in this department about 1743. He did not profess to make a new revelation, but merely to apply a new key to its interpretation. The church first received its form in England in 1783. The doctrine was introduced in the United States in 1784. The followers of Swedenborg now generally claim for him and his writings, a special inspiration.

5. Latter Day Saints. "The church of Jesus Christ

¹ T. Evans.

² Thomas Brown.

of Latter Day Saints was founded upon direct revelation, as the true Church of God has ever been." Joseph Smith, the founder of this sect, was told supernaturally that "all the denominations were believing in incorrect doctrines, and none of them acknowledged by God as His." Smith "was directed not to go after them. On the 21st of September, 1823, a person appeared to him calling himself an angel of God, sent to assure Smith that God's covenant with ancient Israel was about to be fulfilled, and that he [Smith] was chosen to accomplish an important part of it. He received a revelation concerning the aboriginal inhabitants of this country. He was told of the existence of certain plates on which was engraven an abridgment of the records of the ancient prophets that had existed on this continent. On the 22d of September, 1827, the angel delivered to Smith the records. With them was found, also, the Urim and Thummin by which he translated the records which were written in Egyptian characters." In April, 1830, was first organized the church of the Latter Day Saints.¹

This closes the list of Sects in this country, so far as I am able to make out any account of them.

Besides the Sects named above, there are particular congregations scattered all over our land, which are in fact, communions or sects by themselves, and of which no account has here been or can be given. A few individuals taking a dislike to something in the affairs or doctrines of the church to which they have belonged, almost without hesitation, make it a matter of con-

¹ Joseph Smith.

science, withdraw and constitute themselves into a new church wholly independent of, and disconnected from all others.

But, besides all this, the vast majority of our population make no profession of religion at all.

It is, of course, unnecessary to enter at large into a discussion of the connection between these churches and that visible society which has had a continuous existence from the days of Christ. The facts of their origin present nothing that requires anything more to be said than what we have already had occasion to say, and the application of which is too obvious to need repetition here.

I have said of the Primary Sects, and it is still more true of the last two classes that we have noticed, that they make no pretensions to be a part of the Church of Christ. Of course I would not be guilty of a misstatement or misrepresentation. Neither would I dodge or evade any fact or objection that fairly lies in my way. I therefore recur to this assertion for the purpose of explaining it in such a way as to make the whole matter perfectly clear.

When I say, then, that none of these sects make any pretension or claim to be parts of the Church of Christ, I must be understood to use the words in their strictest and most appropriate sense as indicating that society or Church which has had a visible and continuous existence from the time of its first establishment in Judea unto the present day, and which has always been known and called by that name. Now, in this sense of the words, all persons readily admit the cor-

rectness of my assertion. For there is none of these sects that professes (1) to have had a distinct visible existence from the Apostles' days—or (2) to have been founded by a Church that has had such an existence, or by its members *with its concurrence and approbation*—or (3) finally, to be in communion with any Church which has had such a distinct continuous existence, or with one which has been founded by such a Church. On the contrary they profess to have left and forsaken that Church and its branches on account of a disagreement in doctrine, discipline or worship, in order that they might found one that should be different in those respects, and more agreeable to their own opinions and consciences.

Yet, in another sense it seems they do claim to be parts of the Church of Christ or Christian churches. I confess that I am somewhat at a loss to know in what terms they would give a precise and definite statement of the grounds of this claim. It would probably include several items—such as (1) a conformity to the Scripture model—(2) a harmony with the Apostolic doctrines—(3) the fact that there have always been persons who entertained the same views as themselves—and (4) that any number of true believers, associated for the purpose of religion, are a branch of the Church of Christ.

Now we may admit all of these claims without at all interfering with our main proposition—for I have undertaken to identify only that visible Society or Church which was founded by Christ and the Apostles, and I have undertaken to show that these Sects

are, none of them, identical parts of that Church. This they admit, and it holds equally true, if the grounds stated above on which they claim to be considered churches of Christ be admitted. The admission, however, will raise a new issue.

It is no part of my design to deny that these sects are Christian churches—that is, churches or societies sincerely professing to be founded on the Christian Faith, regulated and governed by Christian principles, and aiming at the Salvation of the souls of men. But as visible Societies, they are all distinct one from another. Historically, for instance, there can be no more doubt that the Presbyterian church is a separate society, from that which our Lord and His Apostles commenced, than that the Presbyterians and the Methodists are two and distinct Societies.

The Primary Sects had, as we have seen, some idea of a church and of church authority, and they regretted their deficiencies in this respect quite seriously. I have quoted Calvin and Luther, and Wesley, the founder of the Methodists, to this effect. But soon all idea of the Church as a divinely founded institution passed away, and in some cases, as among the Congregationalists and Baptists, their members went quite into the opposite extreme of denying any church, except such as the members themselves could form by a voluntary association with one another.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND SINCE THE REFORMATION.

WE now recur to the Church of England in order to explain a few events in its history, from the commencement of the Reformation in the reign of Henry VIII, to 1789, at which time the Branch of the English Church in America, was fully established, and became complete in its organization and independent in its existence.

The common impression is, that at the time of the Reformation the Church was all broken to pieces, all organization had come to an end, and the people organized themselves again and anew into denominations according to their own convictions or preferences. The Clergy, it is supposed, were all adherents of Rome, and as such, abandoned their positions or were cast out of them. Or, perhaps, the masses of the people do not go so far, or care to think, or have any thought at all on this point. They merely believe, or rather acquiesce in, the opinion that has been rather seduously inculcated for partisan ends—that the Church was all dissolved—the people had broken

away from the old organization, and had nothing that they could do but to organize themselves into churches as best they could, or in accordance with the views they might happen to have.

Now, the prevalence of this view suits the two classes of people that we have around us. It suits the sects that arose at the time of the Reformation, or have arisen since, because it puts our Church—the *Protestant Episcopal* Church, as they prefer to call it—on the same footing as themselves—the *Presbyterian* Church, the *Congregational* Church, the *Methodist* Church, the *Unitarian* Church, and such like other denominations.

And it suits the claims and the aims of the Romanists for the same reason: it is an assertion of *dis-continuity* on our part, an admission, if we accept the statement, that we *left the Church* when we left Romanism and the See of Rome, and that we are therefore no better, so far as historic continuity and identity with the Church which our Lord founded, are concerned, than any of the other sects. Hence they base their arguments, in talking with our people, that to return to the Church, we must return to Romanism; there can be for us in the West, at least, whether Episcopalians or Christians of any other denomination, neither Christ nor salvation, without union with the Church of Rome and submission to the Pope.

But we have seen that the Church of Christ was established in England in the first century, that it continued perfectly independent of any foreign jurisdiction until after the Saxon invasion, until the close of

the sixth century, that from that time the Papal influence increased in England until its final rejection by the Church as a united body, in 1534, and that since that time, the Church of England, with those derived from it, constitutes the chief part of the third Great Division of the Catholic Church of Christ—to wit: the Reformed.

Henry VIII, died in 1547, and was succeeded by his son, Edward VI, January 29. During the last ten years of Henry's reign, he had rather retarded than promoted the Reformation. The spirit which had been thus repressed, burst forth with perhaps too much of impetuosity on the change in the sovereignty. The first reformed Liturgy was published May 4, 1549, and came into use the *Whitsunday* following.¹ The first Book of Homilies had been published in July before. But before the end of 1551, the Prayer Book had been again revised and materially altered. This second Prayer Book of Edward VI, was brought into use from the Feast of *All Saints*, November 1, 1552. In the next year the *Articles* (now XXXIX, but then XLII, in number) were published.

But it pleased Almighty God to put a stop to the rapid progress of this work by the death of Edward, who was succeeded by his half-sister Mary, July 6, 1553. Mary was the daughter of Catherine of Arragon, and a zealous Papist. She set about restoring Popery to its former position in the English Church, and thus occasioned the first of those events, which, for our purpose, we need to consider.

At the time of the rejection of the Papal Suprem-

¹ Cardwell's Two Liturgies of Edward VI, compared. Pref. p. 13.

acy, the Church of England consisted of two Archbishops and nineteen Bishoprics—twenty-one in the whole.¹ Besides the immediate acts of the chief Pastors, or Bishops of these Sees, the ecclesiastical authority was exercised by Convocations and Synods as follows: There were two Convocations, one for the province of Canterbury, and one for that of York. These Convocations usually assembled separately, though they often transacted business in common. They consisted of two Houses each—the upper composed of the Bishops of the Province, and the lower Priors, Deans, Archdeacons, Proctors, etc., etc.² The Convocations assembled only at the call of the king and transacted no business without his permission. The Synods, on the other hand, are councils of the Church assembled by the Archbishops, or by the general consent of the Bishops, and act independently of the State.

After the Reformation had been commenced, six new Bishoprics were erected during Henry VIII's reign, 1540–1542—*Chester, Oxford, Gloucester, Peterborough, Westminster* and *Bristol*. Westminster, however, was dissolved and united to London, in the Parliament which met January 23, and sat until April 15, 1552.³ The *Bishopric* of Gloucester was suppressed the same year and added to Worcester.⁴

¹ Canterbury, London, Winchester, Ely, Lincoln, Coventry and Litchfield, Salisbury, Bath and Wells, Exeter, Norwich, Carlisle Worcester, Hereford, Chichester, Rochester, St. David's, Landaff, Bangor, St. Asaph, York, Durham.—COLLIER, vol. iv, p. 188.

² Lathbury's *Hist. of Convocation*, p. 99.

³ Burnett's *Hist. Ref.* vol. ii, p. 302. N. Y. Ed. 1842.

⁴ Burnett vol. ii, d. 324.

Durham was suppressed by the Parliament in March of the next year [1553] with the design of establishing two in its stead. But Edward dying soon after, this design does not seem to have been carried into effect.¹

Hence at the commencement of Edward's reign, there were twenty-seven Bishoprics in the English Church. Westminster, Gloucester and Durham having been suppressed during his reign, there were only *twenty-four* when Mary came to the throne, July 6, 1553. In the August following she restored the See of Durham,² and it was confirmed by the act of Parliament in April of the next year [1554].³ I have not been able to find in any documents within my reach an account of the restoration of Gloucester, or the date. But I find in Burnett⁴ a declaration, that on or before the 18th of March [1554] a *cong   d'   lire* was issued to the Dean and Chapter of Gloucester, among others, for the election of a Bishop, and Brooks was elected. He died in the year following, and the See was vacant when Elizabeth came to the throne. It has since been united to Bristol.

Ripon was erected in 1836, and Manchester, 1847, so that the whole present number is twenty-seven.

During the most of Edward's reign there were *twenty-seven* Bishoprics. At the commencement of Mary's reign, however, there were only *twenty-four*,

¹ Burnett, vol. ii, p. 342. See also Collier, vol. v. p. 501, 502.

² Burnett, vol. ii, p. 382.

³ Collier, vol. vi, p. 71 and Burnett, vol. ii, p. 434.

⁴ Burnett, vol. ii, p. 427. See also Worksworth's Eccl. Biog., 3d Ed., vol. ii, p. 461, n. 8.

but during her reign there were, for the most part, *twenty-six*.

My object in these statements has been to get at a definite fact whereby to determine what, in the estimation of the English Church, was at that time necessary to constitute an Ecclesiastical body, or Convocation, capable of acting in a legislative capacity, or in such a way as to have its acts binding on the Church.

During the reign of Henry VIII, no changes in the Clergy were made in order to effect the Reformation. Fisher of Rochester, however, refused to acknowledge the Supremacy of the King over all persons in his kingdom, claiming that supremacy for the Pope. He was accused of high treason, and beheaded June 22, 1535, aged seventy-seven.

In the reign of Edward VI, there were several deprivations for political and religious causes. October 1549, Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London, was deprived of his See. In April of the next year, Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, was also deprived. The cause in both cases was partly political, and partly ecclesiastical. There were also four other deprivations during this reign; Day, of Chichester, Heath, of Worcester, Voisy, of Exeter, and Tunstal, of Durham.¹

I do not design to undertake the defense of all these things. I mention them only for their bearing upon the question of the identity of the English Church, through the period named above, that is, from 1534 to 1789.

¹ Collier, vol. v. p. 425, 441, 500.

None of these deprived Bishops continued to claim their Sees or to exercise the functions of their office after their deprivation, and their places were immediately filled by others. Six out of *twenty-seven* were a minority too small to affect the integrity of the Episcopate, and no pretense is set up that the identity of the Church was lost, or that a division *in the Church* or a *secession from it*, was effected thereby.

But on the accession of Mary, we find changes made that were of a different character. She recalled all of the Bishops named above, as having been deprived, except Voisy, who had died. Four Bishops were imprisoned—*Ridley* and *Latimer* in the Tower, *Hooper* and *Coverdale* in the Fleet.¹ Soon afterwards *Holgate*, Archbishop of York, was sent to the Tower also.² In March, 1553-4, *four* Bishops, *Holgate*, of York, *Ferrar*, of St. David's, *Bird*, of Chester, *Bush*, of Bristol,³ were deprived for being *married*. In the same month *Taylor*, of Lincoln, *Hooper*, of Gloucester, and *Harley*, of Hereford, were deprived on the ground that they held their sees *only during the King's pleasure*,⁴ a condition which Mary pretended they had forfeited.⁵ Bishops *Poinet*, of Winchester, *Barlow*, of Bath and Wells, *Scorey*, of Chichester, and *Coverdale*, of Exeter, had been compelled to flee the country in order to save themselves. And besides these, *Cranmer*, Archbishop of Canterbury, had been attainted of

¹ Collier, vol. vi, page 14.

² Ibid. page 64, comp. 66.

³ Ibid. page 23.

⁴ *Durante bene placito*.

⁵ Ibid. page 65.

high treason for signing the instrument settling the crown upon Lady Jane Grey.¹

Thus *thirteen* Bishops, viz: Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Coverdale, Holgate, Ferrar, Bird, Bush, Taylor, Harley, Poinet, Barlow, and Scorey, a majority out of all that were in possession of Sees when Mary came to the throne, were deprived and put to silence by her on one pretense or another; this was not done, however, by any competent ecclesiastical authority. It was, therefore, as completely an act of persecution against the Church as though it had been done by the Emperors of Pagan Rome, or the Authorities of the Mahometan Imposter. The places of these men were all filled by Mary with men who were violent Papists. And besides these, as we have seen before, Durham was restored, and Tunstal, a Papist also, restored to that See.

Hence fourteen Bishops of her own choosing were put into possession of Sees in England, to fill vacancies of her own creating, within a very short period after Mary came to the throne.

With a majority *thus* provided it is not at all wonderful that the Queen succeeded in making any changes in religion that she chose to make.

Latimer had resigned his See during the reign of Henry VIII. He, with four other Bishops, Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, and Taylor, were burnt at the stake for their refusal to conform to Papacy. From the list given by Maitland,² it appears that no less than *two*

¹ Collier, vol. vi, page 36.

² *Essays Subjects Connected with the Reformation in England* pp. 576-582.

hundred and seventy-seven persons, including five bishops just named, suffered martyrdom for their religion during this reign.

Of the Bishoprics, *six*, to wit: Canterbury, Hereford, Bangor, Gloucester, Salisbury, and Oxford, were vacant by death, on Elizabeth's accession, November, 1558: *four* became vacant by the death of the incumbent before the oath of supremacy was offered them, to wit: Rochester, Chichester, Norwich and Bristol. *Fourteen* Bishops were deprived for not acknowledging the Queen's supremacy, and *one*, Anthony Kitchen, of Llandaff, took the oath. Of the deprived Bishops, some of them, as Bonner, Gardiner and Tunstal had, in Henry VIIIth's reign, acknowledged and maintained the very supremacy which they now refused, and for refusing which, they were deprived.

From the foregoing account it appears that only one of the Bishops in England that was in the exercise of Episcopal functions at the close of Mary's reign, continued to hold his office after the accession of Elizabeth. Stanly, of Sodor and Man, also retained his place.¹ But of the fourteen Bishops deprived, *three*, to wit: Christopherson, of Chichester, Bourne, of Bath and Wells, and Tuberville, of Exeter, at the least, held Sees, whose lawful Bishops had been driven out by violence, and consequently, after their return, they were the rightful incumbents of those Sees. Hence the number that were ejected by the oath of supremacy, is reduced to *eleven*. Thus *fourteen* Sees, a ma-

¹ Bramhall's *Vindication of the Protestant Bishop's Consecration*. Works, vol. iii, page 232, ed. 1844.

jority out of the twenty-six, were at that time vacant in the course of nature, or filled with Bishops who acknowledged the supremacy, and who would concur in restoring the Reformation; and this, too, without any ejection either violent or otherwise, on the part of Queen Elizabeth.

Kitchen conformed. Barlow, Scorey, Coverdale, Hodgkins—besides some suffragan Bishops—returned from abroad and were put into a condition to resume their duties and jurisdiction. By these Bishops the vacant Sees were filled up.

The restoration of the Reformation seems to have been generally popular, as is to be inferred from the fact that only one hundred and eighty-nine out of about ten thousand (that is, less than one in fifty), of the Clergy, refused compliance.¹

Now, in the first place, the fourteen non-conforming Bishops did not draw off a party with them over whom they continued to exercise jurisdiction. They lived and died vacant Bishops—some in England (eleven), and the rest (three) went beyond seas.² And when, some ten years after, the Papal adherents seceded and formed a Sect by themselves, these Bishops were not placed over them, nor did they set up any claims to be Bishops over any body, or any thing in England.

And here again I must say that I am not now aiming to justify all that was done by Elizabeth. The whole matter may be stated thus in the alternative. If the proceedings of Mary, in restoring popery, are

¹ Short's *Hist.* § 407.

² Collier, vi, p. 251.

held to be valid, then the proceedings of Elizabeth are much more so: for they were less the result of the exercise of secular and political authority. But if the proceedings of Elizabeth are not valid, on account of the secular authority used in bringing them about, then those of Mary are not valid for the same reason, acting with an hundredfold greater force, and popery was never lawfully established during her reign, and no authority of any kind, either secular or ecclesiastical, was required to abolish it on the accession of Elizabeth. In either case Protestantism was legally and validly established in the English Church in the first years of Elizabeth's reign.

The identity of the Church, therefore, was not affected by the occurrences of this period.

The See of Canterbury, which had become vacant by the death of Pole, who died within a few hours—twenty-two—after the death of Queen Mary, was filled by the Consecration of Matthew Parker.

Parker's consecration has been denied by certain advocates of the Papal Supremacy; and, so far as we can see, for purely partisan purposes. He was consecrated December 17, 1559; and scarcely any fact in English history is better known. It was a public act, performed in the presence of a multitude, and Parker was universally recognized by all persons, without a dissenting voice—not even the Papists themselves doubting it or making any objection *at the time*—and he proceeded with the discharge of his public functions to the day of his death.

The story was first invented by one Christopher

Holywood in 1603 ; some forty years after the event took place. Parker was consecrated in the chapel at Lambeth, and the occurrence is recorded, in detail, in the contemporaneous accounts, in the Lambeth Register, and in the manuscript of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge—the college in which he graduated.

But suppose he had never been consecrated,—what then ? I do not ask what effects it might have had on the ministerial acts which he performed, other than that of contributing to the succession ; but in regard to the succession of Bishops and the validity of their orders, what would have been the consequences if, through some oversight or negligence, Matthew Parker had not been consecrated at all ? Almost none—none in fact whatever : for he never consecrated any other Bishop *by himself alone*. In all cases the old law—a law as old as the Apostolic Canons—had required that, for the security of the succession, there should always be three, or at least two, present and participating in the act of consecrating a Bishop. But it was always held that the consecration by *one* Bishop alone, though irregular, was valid. St. Paul does not seem to have had any other Bishop with him when he gave to Timothy his authority to ordain others by the “laying on of *his* hands.”¹ And although such ordinations are of very rare occurrence, yet several of that kind are pointed out as having occurred in the Romish Church. If, therefore, Parker had had no consecration, his defect could not have rendered the consecration of those on whom he laid his hands *with*

¹ 1 Tim. i, 6.

others; since the imposition of hands, by any one of them, would have made the consecration good—as good as though he had not been present.

In fact, the succession is a cord—a threefold cord—with many fibres. Each bishop is but one. He lasts but a short time, comparatively, while the continuity never ceases, and never depends on him alone; there are always three at least at any consecration, hence the succession is not broken if *one* of the fibres be broken or good for nothing. The rest holds good and preserves the continuity and the line forever.

But the objection of those Romanists who think that no consecration is valid without the Pope's co-operation, implying consent on his part and an acknowledgment of his authority on the part of the person who is consecrated, is worthy of more consideration and respect. If one has got his mind so thoroughly pre-occupied with the idea of the Papacy, that he thinks that "the Church is nothing without the Pope," he may be pitied, I suppose, but he must be considered. I shall do nothing for such an one now, but to make what I have said if possible a little more plain. There is no *contemporary* evidence that St. Peter was ever at Rome. The expression and the idea of "the Chair of St. Peter" did not arise until some hundreds of years after his death, whether at Rome or elsewhere; the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, shows beyond question that his ministration was at that time, in the estimation of the whole Church, confined to Rome and the *suburbicarian* cities; it certainly did not extend to or include Milan on the north, nor yet France on the northwest;

and the Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, reaffirmed the doctrine of limiting *all* Bishops—the Bishop of Rome expressly included by name—to the Provinces that were then and had been under their jurisdiction, in “all Dioceses and Provinces everywhere,” and declared moreover that if any Bishop—the Bishop of Rome included—should introduce any other regulation or custom contrary to that which had always prevailed, “the whole holy Œcumenical Synod has decreed that it shall be of no effect.” If then there be any such doctrine in regard to the Papacy as to make it essential to the whole Church, it must be of comparatively recent origin and in contradiction with the doctrine of the Catholic Church.

But this is a very extreme opinion, and is not, as I apprehend, to be treated with much respect. The highest Roman authorities—even the Pope himself—recognized the validity of the English Orders, so long as there was any probability of getting England and her queen, Elizabeth—that is, until 1568–9—back to an acknowledgment of his supremacy. It is even said on fairly good authority that he would have consented to the legitimacy of the orders of her Bishops, the marriage of the clergy, communion in both kinds, the services in English, and in fact the English Prayer-book itself with very few changes, if only the English queen and nation would return to submission and obedience to his authority. In fact he was ready to concede pretty much all that the English had gained or cared for, if by so doing he could retain his supremacy over the nation and people of England. There was no

doubt then about the validity of their Orders. Even the story about Parker's ordination was not invented until some thirty-five years afterwards.

In fact the question of the validity of the orders administered by the English Bishop was not settled or adjudicated for something like one hundred and fifty years after the time we are speaking of.

In 1704 John Gordon, Bishop of Galloway, in Scotland, apostatized to the Romish Communion. This brought the question of his ordination before the Romish See. Gordon had requested ordination in the Romish Communion, thereby denying the validity of that which he had had before. The examination of the subject at that time, proves that it had not been previously regarded as a settled question. Clement XI, however, decided against the validity of Protestant ordinations; and since then I believe they have been generally regarded by the Romanists as of no force or validity whatever.

It would be entirely foreign to my plan to enter into a discussion of the grounds on which this decision of the Roman See is based, in this place. Many reasons are given for it by the Romanists; as is usually the case with those who are determined to do what they can find no one good reason for doing. If the Protestant ordinations were invalid in 1704, then they must have been so from the moment when the rejection of the Papal Supremacy took place, and ordinations began to be held without the Papal consent or approbation. But the validity of the Anglican ordinations was distinctly admitted by the Papists, as we

have seen, in the reign of Mary, and again in that of Elizabeth, her successor on the Throne of England. It is true, indeed, that a Bull of excommunication was issued against Elizabeth, and all her subjects, who were in the communion of the English Church, by Pius V, in 1659. But, as has been said, the Pope had then neither in fact, nor by right, any authority in England, or over the English Church. Nor had any of the Bishops who were then in the exercise of the duties of the office—and whom he included in the pretended excommunication—been ordained under his supremacy—by his permission and approbation, or even with his knowledge. Of course, therefore, they were under no obligations to him; and his excommunication could have no effect upon them (as is sometimes contended), on the ground that they had derived their authority from the Pope and that he that gave them their authority could take it from them again.

Of course the Pope's adherents must maintain the validity of the Bull; and in consequence deny the validity of all ministrations within the English Church and its branches, after this pretended excommunication. They are consistent therefore in denying the validity of our ordinations. But the force of the Bull depends exclusively upon the divine right of the Papal Supremacy. If that, as we contend, and as I think I have abundantly proved, is a mere anti-Christian usurpation, then of course Pius' Bull, and excommunication are of no force, and the whole ground for rejecting the validity of the English, Scotch and American Ordinations is shown to be untenable. It is, in fact, a mere expedient of malicious bigotry.

By many of the Roman Catholics, however, we are regarded merely as schismatics, whose ministerial acts are valid in themselves, and only voidable as an act of discipline by the highest authority to whom we are answerable. They claim to be that authority—with how much reason, may be seen from what has already been said. But, for the most part, an insane fury for the establishment of that most anti-Christian dogma which lies at the foundation of the system they are now engrossed in propagating—the Papal Supremacy—has driven them to disregard and outrage all considerations, not only of charity and truth, but also of decency and decorum.

On the 23d of February, 1569, the Pope, Pius V, issued his Bull by which Queen Elizabeth was declared ‘a heretic and an encourager of heretics; those that adhere to her lie under the censure of an anathema, and are cut off from the Body of Christ.’ ‘We likewise,’ says the Bull, ‘declare the said Elizabeth deprived of the pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity and privilege, whatever, and that all the nobility and subjects of the said realm, who have sworn to her in any manner whatever, are forever absolved from any such oath, and from all obligations of fidelity and allegiance.’ ‘We likewise command all the nobility, subjects and others above mentioned, that they do not presume to obey her orders, commands or laws, for the future.’

“The Romish Sect in England was at first governed by Jesuits and Missionary priests, under the superintendence of Allen, a Roman Cardinal, who lived in

Flanders, and founded the Colleges at Douay and Rheims. In 1593 George Blackwell was appointed Arch-Priest of the English Romanists, and this form of ecclesiastical government prevailed among them until 1623, when Dr. Bishop was ordained titular Bishop of Chalcedon, and sent from Rome to govern the Papists in England. Dr. Smith, the next Bishop of Chalcedon, was banished in 1629, and they were without a Bishop until the reign of James II."

Eleven of the Bishops who refused to acknowledge Elizabeth's supremacy, as we have before seen, remained and died in England. The last of them, Watson, of Lincoln, died in 1584. But the Romish seceders were never placed under their jurisdiction. Nor did they claim to be Bishops over them. Not even this pretense to be the Church of England, was set up for the Papists, by their most zealous defenders.

These titular Bishops, of whom we have spoken as placed over the Papists in England, were called Bishops *in partibus*, and *Vicars Apostolic*. "This is an officer," says Butler, "vested with Episcopal authority, by the Pope, over any Church which is in want of a Bishop, but which, *for some reason, cannot have one of its own*." But if the Papists were a branch of the Church of Christ, having lawful jurisdiction in England, there was no reason why they could not have Bishops of their own. Butler was himself a Papist—his admission, therefore, is specially important.

Butler's admission is a confession that the English Papists were not a branch of the Church of Christ, competent to the performance of ecclesiastical func-

tions. They were mere intruders into a field which the Lord had committed to other laborers.

This is a most important fact. They were Papists, I admit, and in communion with the Churches in the Roman Obedience. But such was not the Church of England at that time. The Papal adherents in that country could be only a Sect in opposition to the Church; and whatever sympathy, countenance, or support, they might have from the members of another branch of the Church in a different country, could not benefit their situation in England. But by seceding from the Church of England, they had seceded from the Church wholly and altogether, whilst they remained in England, and lost their power of extending its communion within the English Dominions.

This, then, was the beginning of the formation of Sects in England. In order they stood thus:

1. In 1569, Pope Pius V issued a Bull calling upon all who regarded his authority to secede from the English Church, and form themselves into a Sect in subjection to him. This Sect was first governed by Jesuits and Missionary Priests. In 1593, an Arch-Priest was appointed over them, and not until 1623, were they placed under *titular* Bishops.

2. Perhaps as early as 1567, persons who had learned Presbyterianism during their residence abroad, in Mary's reign, began to secede from the Church, hold meetings, and form a sect by themselves. The first Presbytery, however, was organized at *Wandsworth*, in the county of Surrey, about four miles from London.¹ This occurred 1572. Other Presbyteries

¹ Collier, vi, p. 529.

were soon organized in other parts of England: and thus commenced the Presbyterian Sect in England.

3. In 1583, Robert Brown organized a Society or church, on Independent or Congregational principles—and thus began another Sect in England. They are, perhaps, best known as “*the Puritans*.”

Besides these, there was also a small Sect of Baptists or Anabaptists.

But all these sects put together, included only a very small part of the population of England. The great mass of the people still remained in the Church.

No one of these sects ever claimed to be “the Church of England,” properly so called. But on the contrary, by their acts and by their admissions, they acknowledged themselves to be new Sects.

We have seen that up to this time, 1623, and even much later, the adherents of Rome made no claim or pretense to be the Church of England—they were mere *schismatic intruders*.

But with regard to the Protestant Denominations, beside “building on another man’s foundation,” they lacked the historic Episcopate, without which no body or denomination of Christian believers had ever been acknowledged to be a true Branch of the Church.

There appears, to most persons, to be but very little said, in the New Testament, concerning the organization of the Church; and from this the inference is very generally drawn, that the organization is of little or no consequence.

For this absence of detailed account of the organization, several reasons may be assigned.

In the first place the Apostles were sent to *preach* the Gospel, and we have no record of anything having been said to them about *writing* it. Besides that, in the execution of their mission, they did *preach* the Gospel and establish the Church far and wide, before any part of the New Testament was written. The Epistles to the Thessalonians, being among the very first of that we have, were written about A. D. 52, or nearly twenty years after the Crucifixion; and the Gospels were not written for some years, perhaps about ten more. And before this time Churches had been already organized, if not throughout the world, yet wherever any of the Books of Holy Scriptures were circulated, and among all the people for whom they were intended.

In the second place the Apostles themselves and the apostolic men organized the church for the people. The organization of a Church does not appear to have been any part of the business or duty of the people. Hence no instructions were given them on that subject. Their instructions are limited to what *they* are themselves to believe and to do—their faith and their duty to God and to their fellow men. There are no instructions intended to guide them in the organization of a church.

But in the third place, we have something on this subject. In Acts vi we have an account of the ordination of Deacons. But then the ordination was by the Apostles, although the people “looked them out.” So, too, in the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus we have instructions about organizing the Church in

their respective places—Ephesus and Crete. But the instructions were given, not to the people but to these men, who were instructed, and had been some how or other *authorized* to organize the Church in those places. St. Paul says expressly in the case of Timothy that it was *by* the laying on of his hands—*with* the laying on of the hands of the presbytery doubtless, but *by* the laying on of his apostolic hands. The instructions then, were given to those who had the duty and the responsibility, as well as the authority, to effect an organization and to regulate their church affairs for them. The Apostles and the men that were sent by them organized the Churches—one in every city and nation, and there was no need, as there was no permission, to form another. Hence no instructions were given to the people on that subject.

But whatever may have been the primitive organization of the churches, we have seen from St. Ignatius¹ that at the beginning of the second century they had been established in all the world and with a ministry in three orders, so that without them there was no church. And although we have mention of many Churches with no account of their organization, we have no account of the organization of any one that had not the three orders. And surely we cannot infer from the fact that *nothing was said about their organization*, that they were Presbyterian or Congregational.

From the restoration of the Reformation at the accession of Elizabeth until the Rebellion of 1640, nothing further occurred that we need to notice in this place.

¹ Ad Trall., iii.

From the restoration of the Reformation at the accession of Elizabeth until the Rebellion of 1640, nothing further occurred that we need to notice in this place.

I need not now enumerate the causes which contributed to the growth of Puritanism in England. In 1640 the Church entered upon a more energetic course than it had previously pursued, to prevent the spread of Popery, and other forms of error in England, which provoked a determined resistance from all against whom these efforts were directed. The calamities that overtook the Church, however, arose to a very great extent from her alliance with the State, the administration of which had become unpopular, and needed reformation.

Early in November, was assembled what is called the Long Parliament. They soon resolved themselves into a "Committee of Religion," and this branched off into divers sub-committees, one of which was for providing "preaching ministers and for removing scandalous ones." On the 10th of March a bill was brought into the House of Commons and passed "that no Bishop should have any vote in Parliament." The bill, however, did not pass the Upper House.

On the 17th of July, the Commons undertook a measure for materially changing the form of Church government, but finding it impossible to accomplish any of their plans while the Bishops retained their constitutional seats in Parliament, thirteen of the Bishops were impeached of high treason. The ground of their impeachment was, in fact, the fidelity with

which they had done their duty according to the laws of the Church and of the Realm. This impeachment was found untenable, and dropped soon after it was made. The opposition to the Bishops increased, however; and soon after, they were prevented from going to attend in their places in the House of Lords by a mob throwing stones, etc., etc., at them. The mob was encouraged by the Commons. The Bishops protested against the validity of any laws that might be passed while they were thus deprived of their vote. They were immediately impeached of high treason for this protestation, and imprisoned in the Tower. Soon after, hostilities actually commenced against the king.

In May, 1643, the Commons (who were now the only branch of the Parliament that can be regarded as responsible for what was done) called the famous Westminster Assembly, for remodeling their ecclesiastical affairs. An arrangement was made with the Scotch Covenanters, by which the Scotch were to assist the English against their king, and the English were to abolish Episcopacy and establish Presbyterianism in the English Church. In October, 1644, it was declared in Parliament, that Presbyterian ordinations should be held valid in the Church of England. The Ordinance for abolishing the Common Prayer and establishing the Presbyterian Directory was finally passed March 13, 1645, and Episcopacy suppressed by the same authority the 9th of October following.¹ And it was made a crime to use the Common Prayer either in the Church or in their families, punishable with a

¹ Beren's *History Prayer Book*, p. 195.

fine of five pounds for the first offense, ten for the second, and one year's imprisonment for the third.¹

Notwithstanding these laws, the Bishops and the great mass of the clergy never complied. Many of them, as Sanderson, Hackett, Bull, Fell, Alliston and Dolben, continued to use the Book of Common Prayer or to repeat its contents without the Book.

This change it will be observed was made by an authority that was purely and exclusively secular—for the Bishops had been excluded from the House of Lords by the mob, and then by attainder; and the Westminster Assembly were only a committee to prepare matters for the Parliament to set forth and enforce by its own authority. We certainly cannot call the Parliament and its adherents *the Church of England*, as things then were, without doing violence to all our ideas of identity and all sense of propriety in the use of the language.

We now pass over several years to the Restoration in 1660. On the 29th of May, in this year, Charles II was recalled to the Throne of his ancestors. The Presbyterians had been defeated in their original intention by the Independents, and therefore readily joined with the Churchmen in desiring the Restoration. It is not improbable that they entertained the hope that Presbyterianism might be established in the Church—being a sort of middle ground between Episcopacy and the Independents, who were then the ruling party. But in this they were disappointed. The Restoration necessarily implied the nullification of all

¹ Collier, vol. viii, p. 596.

the laws and ordinances that had passed since about 1643, when the constitutional requisites for the passage of a law had been disregarded. This restored the Bishops and the other Clergy, who had been ejected by Parliament, to their old places again.

Nine out of twenty-six Bishops lived to recover their Sees at the Restoration, to wit: Juxon of London, Pierce of Bath and Wells, Skinner of Oxford, Warner of Rochester, Roberts of Bangor, Wren of Ely, Duppa of Salisbury, King of Chichester, and Frewen of Coventry and Litchfield. The other Sees of course, had not been filled; for the object of the change was to do away with Episcopacy altogether. On the first Sunday in Advent, *six* new Bishops were consecrated for the following Sees: Durham, St. David's, Peterborough, Llandaff, Carlisle and Chester. The remaining Sees were filled soon after, and all things restored in the Church as before 1643.

We have seen the character of the measures which Mary took to secure a majority in the Convocation that should be of her views. When she had done this, *and not before*, she became compunctious about using the *secular* authority for religious purposes, and resigned the *regale* into ecclesiastical hands. On the accession of Elizabeth, *six* Sees were vacant, *four* became so before the oath of Supremacy was tendered to them, *three* were lawfully in the hands of Protestant Bishops, who returned from their exile, and *one* conformed—making *fourteen*, a majority, which were soon filled, without any violence to the laws of the land or the Church, with Bishops who were friends of the Ref-

ormation. Thus by an act of Providence, Elizabeth was saved the necessity of any violent or arbitrary ejection in order to secure a majority in the Church in favor of Protestantism. Providence had done the work before she had any occasion to do it herself. Even the three who held the Sees from which the returning exiles had been unlawfully expelled, would not have been disturbed if they would have acknowledged the queen's supremacy. She could have provided for the returning Bishops in some of the vacant Sees. The other eleven who occupied places for which there were no lawful claimants living, might also have retained their places notwithstanding their religious opinions, if they would have acknowledged her supremacy. But by holding that she herself, and her government, were rightfully subject to the Pope in temporal as well as in ecclesiastical affairs, their opinion was of the nature of treason, and was so regarded. And for this they were ejected.

But in the Rebellion, as it is called, the changes were made without even the pretense of the concurrence of the Church, acting either in Convention or Synod—by any means produced. Neither Convention nor Synod was held—from the commencement of the long Parliament in the autumn of 1640, until the 8th of May, 1661, after the Restoration.¹

The Church of England, therefore, never consented to the change that was made in its Doctrines, Worship, and Polity during that period, and as soon as the state of the kingdom would permit, resumed her

¹ Lathbury's *History Convocation*, pp. 235-239.

former position and went on as before. An effort was indeed made at the Savoy Conference to modify the Liturgy so as to retain some that were inclined to secede, but nothing of importance in this respect was accomplished.

We now pass to the Revolution. On the 18th of May, 1688, seven Bishops drew up a protest and petition against certain measures of King James II, for introducing Popery into his kingdom. This protest was afterward approved and signed by six other Bishops. The measure resulted in James fleeing from the kingdom, and the call of William, Prince of Orange, to the Throne. On the accession of William, however, six of these Bishops—Sancroft, of Canterbury, Turner of Ely, Frampton of Gloucester, White of Peterborough, and Ken of Bath and Wells, refused to acknowledge him as king while James was alive, and were ejected, with a large number of the Clergy, for their refusal. The Non-Jurors, as they were called, continued for some time to maintain a separate communion. Boothe, the last of their Bishops, died 1805,¹ and the party became extinct soon after.

After the accession of William, an attempt was made to change the Doctrines and Worship of the Church materially. But, as Bishop Burnett confesses,² this was not done chiefly through fear of the advantage which the change would give the Non-Jurors in claiming to be the Church of England, and declaring the adherents to William to be seceders.

¹ Lathbury's *Non-Jurors*, p. 412.

² *History of His Own Times*, p. 544, Smith's edition, without date.

This fact is sufficient to determine the identity of the Church after the Revolution with that before it. The ejection of the Non-Jurors may have been unjustifiable (that is a point not now under discussion), but it did not change the identity of the Church.

From this period no change occurred that needs to be mentioned, until after the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, having been founded by members of the English Church, became entirely independent of it, and therefore we need not pursue its history, for our present purpose, any further.

The competency of the English Church to extend the communion of the visible Church of Christ by founding new branches, is, I suppose, sufficiently obvious from what has already been said. Being herself, by her perpetual existence, unquestionably a branch of that Church, and having set up no standard of her own, which she would have interpreted to mean anything contrary to the Holy Scriptures and "the Faith once delivered to the Saints," as held by the Church in its earliest and purest days, and having neither rejected nor lost anything that is essential to its integrity and jurisdiction, she can send forth her missionaries with the assurance that her Lord will accept their work.

In the course of this discussion I have said but very little of the royal supremacy over England that is claimed by her kings except in an incidental way, and the subject is hardly under discussion here. Since the conversion of Constantine, that is, since there has been a *Christian* King or Prince by any title, there

has been some claim to a Supremacy over all persons in the Realm and to a union of Church and State. In a Republic, and at all events with a large number of religious denominations, this is not necessary. Here no one denomination is large enough to control a majority of the votes, and if any one of them should attempt it, it would be pretty sure to effect a combination of all the rest against it; but luckily in this respect at least, there is so much of rivalry and ill will amongst them that no combination to *effect* such a purpose is possible, however much they may combine to defeat it.

But in a monarchy it is far otherwise. The King or Monarch, by whatever name he may happen to be called, expects to reign as long as he lives; and then, at his death, to leave his dominions to his heirs, or to persons who are to be selected by him. They in turn expect to rule during life and to leave their dominions in like manner to those who shall receive them as a life-time possession. Such men, therefore, cannot afford to allow any persons to exercise any authority over their subjects and in their dominions without their consent. They must, if not actually appoint the Bishops and other clergy, yet at least they must have a veto or negative upon all appointments. They cannot afford to risk the possibility of having men of so great influence in connection with their people without being in some way subject to themselves and indebted to them for their offices and under their control. Hence it is a matter of grave doubt whether under a monarchy there can be such a thing

as a total separation of Church and State ; except in those cases where the denominations are so numerous that they may be pitted and played off, the one against another in all matters of a political nature.

The energy however with which the English sovereigns have claimed the so-called "Supremacy of the Church" has arisen to a large extent from the fact that there were a large number of persons in the realm who claimed exemption from the laws of the Realm, in consequence of their clerical character or their allegiance to the See of Rome. But in this country there are no such exemptions. A Romish priest or Bishop even, is as much and as completely subject to the laws of the land and to its courts as any other person. Thus we have solved the most important point in a controversy with regard to the Supremacy of the State. The other part has no concern for us.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

WE come now to a most important stage in the progress of our investigation: the introduction of the Church into the United States.

As this continent was unoccupied by Christians until the sixteenth or seventeenth century, it will be in vain to look for, or expect any establishment of the Church here by the immediate Apostles and Disciples of our Lord. We are, therefore, compelled to look to the labors and efforts of missionaries and colonists of a later date; and all that we can reasonably ask is, that we may find that the Church was extended into this country in accordance with the fundamental principles of its extension and identity already considered.

The first settlement made by any Christian people within the portion of the continent which subsequently became the United States of America, was at Jamestown, in Virginia, May 13, A. D. 1607. Earlier attempts had been made, but they all came to nothing.

“As early as 1580, letters patent were granted by Queen Elizabeth to Sir Humphrey Gilbert, to go to America, and ‘prosecute effectually, the full posses-

sion of those ample and pleasant countries for the crown and people of England.'¹ His patent granted him 'free power and liberty to discover all such *Heathen Lands as were not actually possessed by any Christian Prince or people,*' and to establish his jurisdiction there, 'provided, always, that the statutes he devised should be, as near as conveniently might, agreeable to the laws and policy of England; and provided, also, that they be not against the true Christian Faith professed in the Church of England.'"²

"In consequence of some collision at sea with the Spanish, as it is supposed, this expedition came to no permanent result.

"Though Sir Humphrey had sacrificed the greatest part of his fortune in fitting out his first missionary expedition to this country, yet he was not discouraged by this failure. About five years later, he sold all that remained of his property, and obtained the assistance of other wealthy persons, and fitted out another expedition. He landed at Newfoundland, and after various reverses and misfortunes, was obliged to return. On his way home he was shipwrecked. 'Gilbert was forced, most unwillingly, to turn his course homeward. His own little barge was ill-suited for the violence of the open sea, but he would not forsake his comrades. On the voyage, the storms grew more outrageous, and he was pressed to come on board the larger vessel.' 'We are as near heaven by sea as by land,' was the answer of the gallant man. But he could not save

¹ Wilberforce's *Hist. of the American Church*, p. 9.

² Wilberforce, as above, p. 10.

the crew he would not leave. That same night, as he led the way, his companions in the larger vessel saw the lights of his barque suddenly extinguished. She had sunk, with all on board.'"¹

"Soon afterward, Sir Walter Raleigh obtained a similar patent, and sent forth two vessels for the coast of Carolina. Six times did this man dispatch expeditions on the same errand, till his fortune was expended in the attempt.

"In 1606, a new company applied for, and obtained, from James I, a charter for settling Virginia. Their expedition sailed on the 19th of December, and reached Cape Henry, in Virginia, April 26, 1607. They had with them the Rev. Robert Hunt, a Presbyterian of the Church of England. On the 14th of May, the day after their arrival at Jamestown—the place of their settlement—they took possession of the territory, and Mr. Hunt administered the Holy Eucharist, according to the rites of the English Church, to the company.² Among the first buildings erected was a Church."

"Thus," says Dr. Hawks,³ "Jamestown was the first permanent habitation of the English in America, and Virginia commenced its course of civilization with one of the most impressive solemnities of the Christian Church."

A leading motive in all these efforts at the settlement of America, is declared to have been "*the honor*

¹ Wilberforce's *Hist. of the American Church*, p. 16.

² Wilberforce, as above, p. 22.

³ *Narrative of events connected with the rise and progress of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Virginia*, p. 20.

of God, and compassion for the poor infidels (Indians), captivated by the Devil," it seeming probable that "God hath reserved these Gentiles to be reduced into Christian civility (civilization) by the English nation." And in the patent it is expressly ordered that the officers of the colony "should provide that the true Word and Service of God be preached, planted, and used, according to the rites and doctrines of the Church of England, not only in the said colonies, but also, as much as might be, among the savages bordering upon them;" and "that all persons should kindly treat the savage and heathen people in those parts, and use all proper means to draw them to the service and knowledge of God."¹

In order to show how completely the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the English Church were enforced, I will give an abstract of some of the laws adopted in the colony in the earliest periods of its existence [1611] for the purpose of enforcing them.

The first commands that Daily Prayer, morning and evening, be observed.

No person could speak against the Holy Trinity—blaspheme the name of God—speak lightly of his Holy Word, or demean himself unworthily or disrespectfully unto any minister of the same, under severe penalties.

The sixth law ordains that "every man and woman, daily, twice a day, upon the first tolling of the bell, shall upon the working days, repair into the Church

¹ Wilberforce, pp. 9, 20, 21. See also Hawks's *Narrative*, p. 19.

to hear divine service." No man might break or profane the Sabbath.

Ministers were obliged, in addition to the *daily* Service, to preach on Wednesday and on the Sunday afternoon.

Every person on arriving in the colony must give an account of his or her faith to the minister, and submit to be instructed, if he or she were not sufficiently informed in what every Christian ought to know.¹

With the policy or justice of these laws I am not now concerned. I cite them merely as proofs of the course that was taken to carry out the system of the English Church, and be identical with it.

In 1621-2 met the first Legislature in Virginia, and "among the first enactments were those which concerned the Church." "The general provisions" above recited, "were embodied in a statutory form," and provision was made by law for the support of the Clergy.²

Soon after this there is reason to believe that a small number of Puritans came to the colony; but their number was too inconsiderable to produce any change in the religion of the colony, and public worship continued to be conducted as it always had been, in conformity with the ritual of the Church of England.³

In 1628 Lord Baltimore, father to the Lord Baltimore who settled in Maryland, visited Virginia. The Legislative Assembly was in session, and as he was

¹ Hawks' *Narrative*, pp. 25-27.

² *Ibid.*, p. 35.

³ Hawks, p. 35.

known to be a Papist, they required that he should take the oath of supremacy and allegiance, but he refused. This act, whether right or wrong, in itself shows, and is cited to show the strictness, with which the Virginia settlers adhered to the English Church.

In 1642, however, Puritan discontent had gone so far as to make application to the General Court of Massachusetts to send ministers of *that order* to Virginia, "that the inhabitants might be privileged *with the preaching and ordinances of Jesus Christ.*"¹

It will be remembered that notwithstanding the Puritan insinuation, the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of Christian Ordinances according to the English Church, was established and abundantly provided for in Virginia. Dr. Hawks² remarks, "that it is possible, and indeed probable, that the application was *suggested* by some of those who had emigrated from New England two years before, and sought a home in the southern colonies."

Thus it appears that the Puritans were not content with having everything their own way in their own colony, but they must intermeddle with the more peaceable and harmonious affairs of another colony and cause dissent and confusion there.

The historian, to whom we are already so much indebted, adds: "Up to the period of Harvey's arrival in 1629, there was no complaint. The colonists were content to remain in the bosom of that Church in which they had been reared; and there is ample evidence of a conscientious and general attachment to the faith which was established."

¹ Hawks, p. 51.

² Hawks, p. 52.

The foregoing account has been given so much at length, for the purpose of showing what was the leading design of the first settlers in these States.

The English Church continued to take charge of its children in the colonies—to make provision for their wants—and to gather in the wanderers and outcasts. They were under the Diocesan supervision of the Bishop of London.

I need not go into a detail of the efforts that were made to introduce Episcopacy into this country, before the Revolution; nor enumerate the special acts of supervision and fostering care which were manifested by the mother Church. I will rather pass on to the organization of the Church after the Revolutionary War.

Independence was declared in 1776, and peace made by the acknowledgment of our separate national existence, in 1783. Up to that period this country was a part of the English dominions and dependencies. And when the connection with the mother country was severed, the Church which she had planted became independent also.

As early as August, 1782—that is, before the recognition of the national independence by England—a scheme was proposed for the organization of the “*Church of England people*” into an independent branch of the Church, by themselves. This scheme, however, was purely an individual proposal, and resulted in nothing. It is indeed doubtful, whether if it had been carried into effect, the religious association which would have been the result, would have

been recognized by the Church of England, or any other branch of the Church of Christ, as a part of that Church. And it is certain that the author of this proposal—the venerable Bishop White—afterwards repudiated some of the fundamental points which *were understood* to be combined in it.

The first measure towards completing the organization of a Church in America identical with the English Church, was taken in Connecticut, in March 1783, when at a meeting of the Clergy of the State, the Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D. was elected Bishop for the Church in that State.

I do not however dwell upon this fact at length, for two reasons: first it was only local in its character, and did not *profess* to aim at anything beyond the single Diocese of Connecticut: and secondly, because a single Diocese is not competent to an independent existence as a branch of the Church. There must be, at the least, “two or three” Bishops and Dioceses in order to enable them to perform *all* the functions requisite to their existence—the ordination of Bishops for instance.

But on the 13th of November, 1783, the Rev. Dr. White, afterwards Bishop of Pennsylvania, having previously consulted with the other Clergy of that city, proposed for consideration, at a meeting of the vestry of his parish, the appointment of committees from the different city vestries, to confer with the Clergy on the subject of forming a representative body of the Churches in Pennsylvania.

These Committees met with the Clergy on March

29th, 1784. Another meeting was called for May in the same year, and a Committee was appointed to confer with the Churches in other States.

A few days afterwards a meeting, for another purpose, of several Clergymen from New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, was held at New Brunswick, New Jersey. The proceedings of the Philadelphia meeting were communicated to them, and it was determined to call a fuller meeting in New York, on the 5th of October following. At this convention there were delegates from *Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia.*

At the meeting in Philadelphia, March, 1784, the following basis of a general organization was proposed. It was also brought to the notice of the meeting in New Brunswick, in the May following, and was adopted by the First General Convention that was duly called, viz: September, 1785.¹

“1. That the Episcopal Church is, and ought to be, independent of all foreign authority, ecclesiastical or civil.

“2. That it hath, and ought to have, in common with all other religious societies, full and exclusive powers to regulate the concerns of its own communion.

“3. That the doctrines of the Gospel be maintained as now professed by the Church of England, and uniformity of worship continued, as near as may be, to the Liturgy of the same Church.

¹Bioren's *Journals*, pp. 5, 6, and the Preface by Bp. White.

“4. That the succession of the ministry be agreeable to the usage which requireth the three orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons—that the rights and powers of the same, respectively, be ascertained, and that they be exercised according to reasonable law, to be duly made.

“5. That to make Canons, or laws, there be no other authority than that of a representative body of the Clergy and Laity, conjointly.

“6. That no powers be delegated to a General Ecclesiastical Government, except such as cannot conveniently be exercised by the Clergy and Laity in their respective congregations.”

At the meeting in New York, 1784, eight different States were represented, and it was agreed:—

“1. That there should be a General Convention of the Episcopal Church in the United States of America.

“3. That the said Church should maintain the doctrines of the Gospel, as now held by the Church of England, and adhere to the Liturgy of the said Church, as far as shall be consistent with the American Revolution and the constitutions of the several States.”

There were also other resolutions, 2, 4, 5, and 6, providing for a General Convention, and its meeting, which was to be held in Philadelphia on the 27th of September following.

This may perhaps be regarded as the organization of the Church in this country. It took to itself the name, “Protestant Episcopal”—Protestant to denote

its freedom from Popery, and Episcopal, to denote its adherence to the Apostolic Ministry.

It may be well to notice, particularly, that this was not called, nor regarded as the commencement of the Church in this country. The Clergy and Laity came together, only to provide for some deficiencies in their organization. The Church had been founded here in 1607, by the Jamestown colonists. And now that a separation from the mother country had been effected by the Revolutionary War, they came together to provide for those ministrations and elements of growth and edification for which, until that event, they had depended upon the mother Church, and the mother country.

It may be well, however, to show from the records of those times, that this was not regarded *by those who took part in the transactions*, as the origin or first establishment of the Church in this country. Thus, on the second day of the Convention, it was *Resolved*, that the testimonials produced from *the Churches* in the several States, . . . are satisfactory.¹

Here *the Church* is spoken of as an existing body, and as *one*, though distributed through many States; and that too, before any formal constitution had been adopted, a Liturgy provided, or the Episcopate obtained.

Again, the adoption of the Constitution of the Protestant Episcopal Church was not spoken of as the origin of that Church; the Preamble to the Constitution as reported by a Committee, reads—"Whereas,

¹ Bioren, p. 5.

in the course of Divine Providence, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, is become independent of all foreign authority," etc. It also spoke of meetings of Clerical and Lay Deputies of the said Church previously held.

These expressions are quoted to show that the men of those times did not consider the Church in this country as originating with themselves, but that they did consider that it had been in existence as a Church before their time.

The address to the English Archbishops and Bishops, is also worthy of being referred to for its bearing on several important points now before us. The Convention call themselves "the Clerical and Lay Deputies of the Protestant Episcopal Church in sundry of the United States of America." They say, "Our fathers, when they left the land of their nativity, *did not leave* the bosom of that Church over which your lordships now preside; but, as well from a veneration for Episcopal government, as from an attachment to the admirable services of our Liturgy, continued in willing connection with their Ecclesiastical Superiors in England, and were subjected to many inconveniences *rather than break the unity of the Church to which they belonged.*"

"When it pleased the Supreme Ruler of the Universe, that this part of the British Empire should be free, sovereign and independent, it became the *most important* concern of the members of our communion *to provide for its continuance.*"¹

¹ Bioren, p. 12, 13.

The leading objects which claimed the attention of the Convention of 1785, were (1) a more complete system of union and organization for the whole country; (2) the preparation of the Liturgy, and (3) the obtaining of the Episcopate.

The Constitution reported to that Convention was adopted, with some modification, on the 26th of June the next year, 1786.¹

Before this time, however, the Rev. Dr. Samuel Seabury had been consecrated Bishop of Connecticut, at Aberdeen, in Scotland, on the 14th of November, 1784, by three Scotch Bishops. The reason of his being consecrated in Scotland, rather than in England, is to be found in the fact, that the English Bishops were restrained, by a law of Parliament (not of the Church), from consecrating any Bishops, without certain oaths which could be taken only by Englishmen.

The Convention of 1785, however, made application to England for the consecration of Bishops there. After a series of events, which need not here be recited in particular, an act of Parliament was obtained for the purpose, and the Rev. Dr. Provoost, of New York, and the Rev. Dr. White, of Pennsylvania, were consecrated, in the Lambeth Palace, February 4, 1787. And on the 19th of September, 1790, the Rev. Dr. James Madison was ordained Bishop for Virginia, at Lambeth, in England, by English Bishops.

The Church in America had now four Bishops—a number which, according to the uniform usages and principles of the Church, is competent to perform all

¹ Bioren, pp. 22, 23, 24.

the functions requisite to an independent branch, or Provincial Church.

In 1789, the General Convention met for the first time with a full organization. The Bishops now constituted a separate house. A new Constitution was adopted, and the Prayer-Book, as revised, was set forth, to be used from and after the first day of October, 1790. The Ratification bears date October 16, 1789.

The settlement at Jamestown was the first that was made at all, by any Christian people, within the limits of what was the United States, when they became an independent nation.

In this there was an exact compliance with the terms and principles of the extension of the Church, of which we have already spoken.

1. The settlers were members of the Church, from the English Branch.
2. They came into a country (the English possessions of North America), at that time unoccupied by any other branch of the Church;
3. For the purpose of establishing here "the true Word and Service of God."

That all these conditions were fulfilled, is a matter of fact. The design of the settlers, however, was not exclusively religious. They did not come here for the *sole* purpose of converting the heathen. They claimed the territory for their own, and designed to found a colony, as well as a Church, which should be a part of the Church and the nation to which they belonged. This, however, cannot invalidate the missionary character of their undertaking.

Thus, in the most general view—considering this western continent as unoccupied country—we find that the commencement of these English missionaries was such as to identify their communion with the English Church, and was no violation of the rights or claims of any other branch of the Church.

But there is still another light in which this matter ought to be placed.

From its first discovery, some part of this continent was acknowledged to belong to England. Virginia, and Jamestown—the place of the first English settlement—were within those limits. This fact must be considered as giving the English Church a peculiar right and claim here. The territory was a part of the English dominions. Hence this country—as a part of the English Domain—was a part of England—as much so as though it had been within the Island that is called by that name. Hither Englishmen might come and settle, with all the rights and privileges of Englishmen, subject to the laws of England, and entitled to claim her protection. The right to bring their religion and the peculiarities of their worship with them, will not therefore be questioned. And as these colonies were a part of the English dominions, so also those members of the English Church, who came hither did not lose their membership, or transfer it to another communion, by their removal. They were a part of the English Church still.

It is, indeed, true that Royal Authority gave grants to others of its subjects, who had forsaken the com-

munion of the English Church, to come and settle on this continent also. But something more than Kings' patents, and Parliamentary grants are necessary, to enable persons to found a branch of the Church of Christ. He is the Sovereign of His Earthly Kingdom, and its Colonies must be founded by grants obtained from Him, and in conformity with His laws and institutions.

King Charles, or any other English King, could confer ample authority for founding colonies that should be a part of his dominions and kingdom. But he had no such authority over the Kingdom of Christ.

Of course I am not denying the right of the English Puritans, and other seceders from the English Church, to come and settle in this country. So far as man, or human authority is concerned, their right was unquestionable. But although they had a right to settle here, and to have what religion they pleased, or none, if that had been their choice; still, however, the relation of their ecclesiastical institutions to the identity of the Church could not be changed by the peculiarities of their location. They were persons whose consciences had compelled them to leave the English Church, and they came here, not to establish the Church in which they had found that they could not live at home, but to extend the communion of that which they had themselves founded. It was, therefore, no more a part and branch of that which had always been known as the Church of England, when established in this country, than it was in that which they left in order to come here.

But we must keep in mind the fact that they had been seceders *from* the Church, and not merely a schism *in* the Church, in the primitive and scriptural sense of the word.

And we must remember, too, that the Episcopal Polity, if not of divine institution, that is, if it had not been instituted by the Apostles, acting under the plenary inspiration that was given them by our Lord for this purpose, was, nevertheless, of very early institution, and was unanimously accepted at an early date. We know, in fact, of no *Church* that was organized on any other polity. Of course we read of many churches in those early days of whose organization and polity nothing is said. But we have no account of anything that was regarded as an organization that was other than Episcopal.

Then, too, we have the testimony of Ignatius, who died a martyr not later than 117, probably as early as 97 A. D., who tells us that "without Bishops and Priests and Deacons, there is no Church."¹

Ignatius had been a disciple of St. John, and was, at this time, Bishop of that city in the East where "the disciples of our Lord were first called Christians."² It was a city at that time of some three or four hundred thousand inhabitants. It had been for a while the most influential Church after Jerusalem had been destroyed, and the successor of St. James had taken the title of Bishop of Ælia. Alexandria had not yet risen into the prominence that Clement, A. D. 200, and Origen, A. D. 230, afterwards gave it. And as for

¹ Ed. ad Trall., iii.

² Acts xi, 26.

Rome, it was not yet thought of as the seat of a Primacy or Supremacy of the whole Church.

And it is a little doubtful, from the form of the expression used by St. Ignatius whether he was intending to assert the *fact* that there was no Church without its Bishop—or the *law*, that there could be no Church without the three orders, either in fact or intention—that is, actually intending to get them as soon as practicable.

But whatever he may have intended to say, or was in fact saying, there can be no doubt that he knew whether what he was saying was true or not.

Then we have seen, also, that the very first of the Apostolical Canons requires that at the ordination of a Bishop three, or at least two Bishops should be present; and the second Canon reads, "Let a Presbyter, Deacon and the rest of the clergy (Deaconesses) be ordained by one Bishop."

The Council of Nice, A. D. 325, recognized this fact and law (Canon IV) and provided that in addition to the three Bishops to be present and participating in the consecration, all the other Bishops of the Province should, if they could not be present, give their consent *in writing*, and thus the ordination might be performed."

Of these Provinces six are mentioned by name: Antioch and Alexandria being two of them, Rome being one also and only one, with the rest.

The action of this council, which was a General Council of the whole Church, the first that had been held since that at Jerusalem (Acts xv) was acquiesced

in and ratified by all the three or five Councils (as one chooses to reckon them) that were held before the final separation of the East and West in the eleventh century.

Nor is this all. It is not merely that we have these testimonies to the fact that there were no churches without Bishops, and the provisions of the Canons for the succession of the Bishops and the certainty of the ordination, by requiring two at least to be present, consenting to, and taking part in the ordination. We have two cases which confirm this view, and show that the position was not taken without consideration and a sense of the necessity for such rules.

The one case, is that of Aerius, of Armenia, and the other is that of Colluthus, of Alexandria. Aerius and his fellow student, Eustathius, had been candidates for the Bishopric of Sebaste. Eustathius succeeding in the competition, Aerius claimed to think that there was no difference between the two Orders—Bishops and Presbyters—and that, as a Presbyter, he could ordain the Clergy as well as a Bishop. But his Sect included only a very few members, and did not last long.

The case of Colluthus is more instructive. He seceded from the communion of the Patriarch of Alexandria, became an Arian—that is a denier of the divinity of Christ,—and, because he could get no Bishop to ordain his followers, he claimed to have the right to do it himself: this was in A. D. 319—just before the Council of Nice. And it is not at all unlikely that the Fathers of that Council had his case in mind, when they passed the Canons I have just cited. However, the case had been considered, and his opinion

condemned, by a Council at Alexandria,—“unanimously,” as it is said, by the Bishop of Alexandria.¹

Now, I am aware that the persons I have in mind, care but very little, if anything, for Church authority, even though it be the authority of the whole Church. Yet there is one respect, at least, in which they must regard it. The Church had declared that there was no Church, without its Bishops, in their sense of the word, whether that were the Bible sense or not; and more than that, namely, they had declared that they would not receive or acknowledge any body or number of Christians, who had not a Bishop ordaining their Clergy, as a Branch of the Church; nor yet any number of churches as constituting a Provincial Church, that had not at the least three Bishops, so as to be competent for the ordination of its own Bishops, and for managing all the other matters of a provincial character. The early Church may have been wrong in this matter, but it is too late to correct their error now.

As a practical matter, I suppose that whatever the Church—the early and undivided Church—had thus adopted in a matter of this kind, must stand as Church law; so that if we would be in their communion, or recognized by them, we must abide by it.

And I think that we have both the example and the precepts of our Lord, to this effect. “The power to bind and to loose,” which he gave the Apostles, could not have related to the first founding of the

¹ Theodoret’s *Eccl. Hist.* B. I, 34. Also Athanasius’s *Works*, Vol. I, pp. 134 and p. 193.

Church, merely. This becomes manifest if we refer to the occasion on which the authority was given. It was to be exercised whenever a brother had aught against another. If the matter could not be settled without, he was then to "tell it to the Church."¹

Nor is this all. Although our Lord had come to put a new construction on many passages of the Jewish Scriptures, and although he expressed himself in very severe terms of disapprobation of the teachings of the Scribes and Pharisees, personally and individually, yet when "they sat in Moses' seat," that is, in the Sanhedrim, they were the legitimate Council and law making body of the Jewish Church and people, and the command was "all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do."²

And not only so: He himself took part in their worship. He never seceded from their Church, nor did he permit his disciples to do so, although much, both in the temple service and in the synagogue worship was doubtless of merely human origin. In fact we have no evidence, that I am aware of, that the synagogue services had ever been established by any especial divine command. And yet he attended their services, and in one case, at least, he took part in it, if he did not in fact conduct it wholly.³

And then, too, we have a record⁴ of our Lord's having been in Jerusalem and apparently taking part in one of the feasts which was of purely human—or rather ecclesiastical origin "the feast of the dedication

¹ Matt. xviii, 15.

² Matt. xxiii, 3.

³ Luke iv, 16, 23.

⁴ John x, 22.

and it was winter." We are not told what part he took in these services. But it is evident from the narrative that he did not condemn them nor discourage others in their attendance on them.

The principle on which these remarks are based is recognized and practiced upon, every day, in this rapidly growing Republic. Emigrants are going from the States in which the religious institutions are established on a well-understood basis, into new territories. Some of them are of one religion, and some of another. They locate and form themselves into churches, as they choose. Those who were Presbyterians there, and organize on the Presbyterian platform here, are regarded as a part of the Presbyterian Church still. So with every other denomination. It is not supposed, or held, that their ecclesiastical identity is changed by the change of location. If they adopt different views, and a different organization, then, of course, they will become a different church, or at least a part of a different one; but not otherwise.

So with the first settlers in this country. It was a part of the English dominions—and the settlers were Englishmen, going from one part of the English dominions to another; neither changing nor intending to change either their civil allegiance or their Church-communion and membership.

Until the colonies became a separate nation, by the Revolution, they were considered a part of the English Church. The others that came here were also considered as belonging to the same church, or communion, as that to which they had belonged on the other

side of the great waters, and sustained the same relation to the English Church here as they had sustained there.

With regard to the immigrants from other countries, they were of two classes; those which came to parts of this continent then belonging to England, and those who came to parts belonging to their native countries—as the Spanish in Florida, and the Dutch in New York. The case of these last will be considered by and by. But those who came to settle in the English colonies became thereby subjects of the English crown, and therefore stand on the same footing in relation to the object now under consideration, as Englishmen themselves.

Thus it appears that the Protestant Episcopal Church was founded in this country, then a part of the English dominions, by members—missionaries and colonists—from the Church of England, with the concurrence and approbation of that Church, and under its fostering care. That it is a branch of the English Church, is, therefore, a matter that admits of no doubt.

The fact that the English Church consecrated for them the number of Bishops required by the universal practice of the Church, to constitute an independent Provincial Branch, is proof that they acknowledged the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country to be a part of their own communion. Beside this, there has always been a free communion and good understanding between them. Until quite lately there has been, however, a law of the English Parliament excluding from the pulpits of the English Church all Clergymen

who had not made certain declarations equivalent to an oath of allegiance to the English Government. This, of course, our Ministers had not done, and could not do. Therefore, they were excluded, by a Parliamentary regulation. This law was repealed in 1840. But the validity and regularity of our ministrations have always been recognized and allowed by the English Church, and our Clergy (now that the *political* obstacle is removed) are received to preach in their pulpits, and to minister at their altars; and members going from the Church in this country are received to communion there, simply on a certificate of their having been admitted to communion here, and so, *vice versa*, they are received in this country.

These facts prove identity of communion between the two Churches.

Though hardly anything more can be necessary on the point of our unity and identity with the English Church, yet I will quote the declaration made by the House of Bishops, in this country, May 20, 1814:

“It having been credibly stated to the House of Bishops, that, on questions in reference to property devised, before the Revolution, to congregations belonging to the Church of England, and to uses connected with that name, some doubts have been entertained in regard to the identity of the body to which the two names have been applied, the House think it expedient to make the declaration, and to request the concurrence of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies therein, That the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is the same body here-

tofore known in these States by the name of the Church of England; the change of name, although not of religious principle, in doctrine, or in worship, or in discipline, being induced by a characteristic of the Church of England, supposing the independence of Christian Churches under the different sovereignties to which, respectively, their allegiance in civil concerns belongs." This declaration was concurred in by the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies.¹

During the course of the preceding sections, I have often had occasion to designate Churches by the name of the country in which they are located—implying thereby some sort of a connection between the Churches and the States.

The subject demands a few words of explanation; and we have now arrived at a point in our investigation, where a due consideration of that relation will be of material assistance.

By the nationality of Churches, I do not mean any recognition of the Church, *as a legal establishment* by the State. The idea that I wish to use is equally consistent with *all possible relations* between the Church and State. Whether, as in the Roman Empire in the second century, the State persecutes and opposes the Church; or whether, as in England, it supports it by law; or whether, as in this country, it leaves the Church to itself, neither opposing nor supporting it; or finally, whether, as in Scotland, it establishes a rival Sect—the doctrine which I wish to make use of, is equally consistent with that relation.

¹ White's *Memoirs* pp. 357, 357. Also *Journals of the General Convention*, vol. i. pp. 310, 311.

Where, as in the nations of the old continent, there is a Governing Class consisting of persons who are born to authority, live in its exercise, and leave it to their heirs as an heritage when they die—my opinion is, that they are bound, and must, if they will regard their own welfare, make the Religion of Christ a part of the law of their dominions.¹ This, of course, implies a support of the Church and its institutions.

But, in this country, where we have no such governing class, but only a number of citizens called for a time to execute the people's will in relation to certain matters of a more general concern, no such incorporation of Christianity, its doctrines and institutions, into the laws of the land, can well be made. The People, who are the government themselves, yield their support to religion in another way, and thus perform, without the intervention of the State authorities, what the nations differently constituted can perform only by a union of Church and State.

But the duty of "nations" and "kingdoms" toward the Church is not the subject which I wish now to present to the consideration of my readers. It is rather the fact, that the territorial limits of the jurisdiction of the Church are commensurate with those of the nation in which it is situated. This is what I mean by the nationality of Churches.

There are several considerations derivable from Scripture which confirm this idea.

1. It is obvious that the Apostles, in locating the different and independent branches of the Church, had

¹ Isaiah lx, 12.

regard to the political divisions of the world, as has been already stated.

2. It is evident that the members of the Church, *as Christians*, owe some duties to the government that is over them, and to their governors, such as are incompatible with any allegiance or obedience to persons or governors out of the nation in which they live. Hence it has been held by thoughtful Christians, that a belief in the Papal Supremacy by persons in nations that are politically independent of Rome, is inconsistent with due allegiance to the national sovereignty.

3. But again. In a Christian country, the government or administration must come into either concurrence or collision with the Church and her regulations in regard to some points. Even in this country, where there is the least possible amount of connection between Church and State—some points are assumed, and must of necessity be assumed, by the State. For instance, the officers employed in the administration must either keep or violate the Christian Sabbath. And the nation must have a law upon the subject. If that law regards the day as holy, then, in so far it adopts the doctrine of the Church: if not, then it may require, and in some cases it will require its citizens, if they are members of the Church, to violate their consciences by continuing in secular occupations which the laws have required regardless of the day. The laws of our country recognize this day, notwithstanding the many Jews, Seventh-Day Baptists and infidels, who differ from the Church in their religion on this point. Our Congress, also, adjourns for Christ-

mas and the Holy Days connected therewith, notwithstanding the fact that neither Presbyterians, nor Baptists, nor Methodists—the most numerous denominations in our country—regard them as Holy Days at all. On the subject of marriage and divorce, both the Church and the State must have laws which will be either concurrent or contradictory.

With regard to many of these things, the Scriptures have left the Church to make her own laws and arrangements for the mere circumstantial. If, now, the Church and the nation are co-extensive and conterminous, there will be no difficulty in securing a harmonious arrangement between them. But if there were parts of several different and independent Churches, or the whole of them within the limits of the same State, it would be impossible to adapt the laws so as to harmonize with them all.

When the Church was first planted, regard was had, as we have repeatedly seen, to the secular and political divisions of the earth, so that there should never be two different Churches or ecclesiastical authorities in the same division. And in following down the history of the Church for several centuries, we find this rule to have been pretty carefully adhered to.

“This may be evidenced both from the rules and canons, and known practice of the Church; for when any provinces were divided in the State, then commonly followed a division in the Church also; and when any city was advanced to a greater dignity in the civil account, it usually obtained a like promotion in the ecclesiastical. It was by this rule that the Bishop

of Constantinople was advanced to Patriarchal power in the Church, who before was not so much as a Metropolitan, but subject to the Primate of Hæraclea in Thrace; and this very reason is given by two general Councils, which confirmed him in the possession of this newly acquired power. . . . It sometimes happened that an ambitious spirit would petition the Emperor to grant him the honor and power of a Metropolitan in the Church, when the province to which he belonged had but one metropolis in the State; which was so contrary to the aforesaid rule of the Church that the Great Council of *Chalcedon*, made it deposition for any Bishop to attempt it. But, on the other hand, if the Emperor thought fit to divide a province into two, and erect a new metropolis in the second part, then the Church allowed the Bishop of the new metropolis to become Metropolitan in the Church also. . . . The canons of the Church were made to favor this practice in the erection of new Bishoprics also; for the Council of Chalcedon has another canon which says, that if the Imperial power made any innovation in the precincts or parishes belonging to a city, then the Church precincts might be altered in conformity to the alterations that were made in the political and civil state, which canon is repeated and confirmed by the Council of Trullo.”¹

I am aware that this rule is not one of necessity, and that history presents many exceptions to it. The rule, if strictly adhered to, would present serious difficulties in times of general commotion, when the bound-

¹ Bingham's *Antiquities* Book ix, c 1, § 7.

aries of Empires and Kingdoms are subject to sudden and frequent changes. Still, however, the evils with which the present divided state of Christendom would embarrass the application of the principle, ought not to be urged against its soundness: for those divisions and their causes are themselves anomalies and evils which ought not to exist. We have no right, therefore, to expect the rules and principles of the Church to be such as to sanction and perpetuate them.

If, for instance, any part of Canada should become politically incorporated with the United States—the Church in that part would find no difficulty in coming into our General Convention, and becoming incorporated with the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, for the reason that there is no material difference between us and them in matters of religion. But if we should acquire a part of Mexico, inhabited by a Church in the Roman Obedience—the incorporation would be more difficult, and probably in fact would not take place—so great is the difference between us and them. But yet this should be no objection to the rule laid down; for such a difference has no right to exist between any two branches of the Church. It is itself a wrong.

But the practical object of this discussion is to say—what the practice of all sects and denominations implies and presupposes, namely, that the Branch of the Church which has the right to existence and jurisdiction in any nation at all, has a right to jurisdiction in any and every part of it, and throughout the whole extent of its Domain.

I have aimed in what I have said, to prove the nationality of Churches only so far as is requisite for this practical conclusion. And that, I suppose, I have proved. If not, who shall deny it? Surely no one without condemning himself. There is not a church or sect in this country, that would hesitate to extend itself into any village, town, or settlement, where it was desired, on the ground that some other church or denomination had a society established there. The thing was never heard of. Not a denomination doubts its right to extend its communion anywhere within our country. Now this right is what I mean by the *nationality* of an independent Branch of the Church. And this is the right that I claim for the Church of Christ.

Most of the larger denominations in our country do not hesitate to identify themselves, by *name*, with the country. I believe that all of them that are any ways diffused throughout the country, or ever expect to be so diffused, do so. Thus we have "*The Associate Presbyterian Church of North America*," "*The Reformed Protestant Church of North America*," "*German Reformed Church in the United States*," "*The General Reformed Synod of the American Lutheran Church*," "*The Presbyterian Church of the United States of America*," etc., etc. Thus in some way or other, every denomination recognizes the nationality of their church, and claims the right to extend it into any town or settlement where it may be desired.

The Papists do not so distinctly recognize this prin-

ciple in some of its bearings, while in others they are unbounded in arrogance. They claim the right to extend their jurisdiction everywhere, regardless of others. But still they do not recognize the principle in its relation to the independency of the national Churches. They aim rather to destroy that independence and reduce them all into one consolidated Hierarchy, that the Papal domination may thereby be the more effectually established, or unrestrained in its exercise. And while on the one hand, the uncertainty and variations of the boundaries of the secular kingdoms have doubtless done much to uprear and support that consolidation, let us also admit that the consolidation itself has done much to preserve the nations from those hostile collisions which lead to dismemberment and overthrow.

Now if one is so thoroughly impregnated with the idea of the Papal Supremacy that he can see nothing in the Church—no Church in fact—without it, he is probably beyond the influence of any argument that can be addressed to him.

I know that it is claimed that our Lord, in speaking of building his Church, meant by the Rock, St. Peter himself, instead of the Faith he had just confessed. But this is not the primitive understanding of the passage. The words of our Lord when he said, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," were thought to have received their full and sufficient meaning when (1) Peter made converts of the *Jews*, by preaching on the day of Pentecost, when about three thousand were at once converted and baptized

in (into) the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of their sins; and (2) when Peter first admitted the Gentiles, who had been converted by his preaching at Caesarea, into the full communion and fellowship of the Church. He had thus used his "keys" by opening the Church for the admission of both Jews and Gentiles.

And the other part of the text, as recorded in Matt. xvi,—“and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven,” and “Whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,” is repeated in the next chapter but one (xviii,—), and in this case *to all the Apostles* alike—in exactly the same words. This doubtless conferred on each one of them the authority, whatever it may have been, that had been conferred on Peter.

Whatever, therefore, may have been the meaning of our Lord's words in the first case, and when addressed to Peter alone, they must have the same meaning when addressed to the twelve, so that he was in no way superior to them. Nay, St. James is always regarded and spoken of as the first of the Apostles after the day of Pentecost had fully come, and he, and not St. Peter, nor the beloved disciple St. John, was made the first Bishop of Jerusalem.

We have seen that the Canons of Nice recognizes Rome as one of the Provinces of the Church, and confirms the authority of the Bishops of Rome in that Province.

The Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431, confirmed the decrees of Nice, 325, A. D., and that of Constantinople,

381, now limiting the Bishops of Rome, as in fact the other great Bishoprics, Antioch, Alexandria and Constantinople, etc., each of them to its proper Province.

There is no doubt about the genuineness of these Canons. The scholars of Rome, even in the days of her most supreme trust in the famous or rather infamous forged decretals of Isidore,—never denied or doubted the genuineness of these Canons. Nor did she ever doubt or deny that these Councils—the three, Nice, Constantinople and Ephesus, at least—were general Councils, and represented the whole Church, and expressed the voice of its unanimous decision at that time. They became *the law of the Church* from that time onwards, even in the *professed* estimation of the Bishops of Rome themselves.

Now I do not care to concern myself with an inquiry into “customs” of the Province of Rome at that time. But whatever they were they were limited as the law of the Church for all time, as far as any legislation *of the Church* can go, to this Province. And this, since inspiration has ceased and the Canon of Holy Scripture is completed, is the highest and most sacred law that we can have.

I do not overlook or forget the times that ensued. I know, as Egar¹ has so well shown, that as the early Bishops of Rome were *generally* sound in the Faith, they did good service in receiving appeals from the Bishops of other Provinces than their own, and by giving “opinions” as any wise men might do. And I know, too, that these opinions were of great weight.

¹ Paddock Lectures, 1887,

I know very well, too, that during the long period from Charles the Great to the thirteenth, or possibly the fourteenth century, the Popes often stood firm, like a rock, for Christianity, Christian institutions and the rights of the Ministry, against the attempts of civil Rulers to make the Church and Christianity itself a mere matter of State policy, and a machinery for enforcing civil laws and perpetuating their dynasties. Doubtless some of them were very bad men. Doubtless, too, many of them, perhaps all, resorted to measures of which we cannot altogether approve, and which cannot be altogether reconciled to the Canons of the early Councils that I have cited. These were rude ages. Few people knew much of the rights of others or had much regard for them or the higher principles of law and liberty, as we now understand them. But he that would drive must hold the reins according to the team he has in hand. It was a principle of the Roman law that "the safety of the republic is the supreme law," and I, for one, can excuse the Popes for doing a good many things that seemed to us uncalled for and perhaps unjustifiable on general principles, in order to preserve the Church through these troublous times.

And even now if the people *in their Province* are so degraded and incapable of having opinions of their own, that they must be governed by the Pope, I can see a good reason for the retention of the Supremacy; and I have no doubt it will be retained so long as that necessity lasts. Nay, if the people under his jurisdiction have become so demoralized, and lost to all sense

of truth and honesty as to make compulsory confession necessary as a preparation for the Holy Communion, I would say let them enforce it until their people shall be better educated and made more capable of judging for themselves when they need priestly advice in regard to their spiritual affairs. It is better, in my judgment to obey the Pope and go to confession and get priestly absolution, than not to profess to serve God at all, or not to receive the Holy Communion of the Body and Blood of our Lord.

But when the first rays of the dawning Reformation shone upon Europe, the Popes and their adherents, instead of hailing them with gladness and co-operating with those measures to the extent of their ability, set themselves to oppose the movement and to perpetuate measures which, though they may have been necessary and excusable for the times, would inevitably become, and could only become, injurious and possibly intolerable evils if prolonged beyond the day and the occasion that called them into existence, and justified, perhaps, their existence and exercise.

But any claim to extend them into this country and exercise them here is clearly a violation of the early canons, and is a *schismatic intrusion* into a Province which was not theirs, and has never since been placed under their charge.

As I have said, the Roman authorities do not deny either the genuineness or the *binding force* of the canons of the early councils I have named. And yet in practice they are constantly disregarding them. They are, therefore, simply *schismatics* in our country,

constantly saying "we are of Peter," when Peter never knew them, and when, according to our Lord and St. Paul, there should be no schism in the Body.

But the Church of England and our own recognize and act upon these principles. Though we believe the churches of the East to be ignorant and degraded, and those in the Roman Obedience to be corrupt and idolatrous, we make no effort to establish a purer Branch of the Church in their midst. I say this with a full knowledge of all that might have the appearance of an exception. A caution has been observed, which, whether the course pursued be justifiable or not, has saved them from the violation of the letter of the rule laid down. Thus when the English Bishop Luscombe resided at Paris, he claimed no jurisdiction over the citizens of France or the Netherlands, but only over Englishmen who were *temporarily* residing in those countries. The present Bishop of Gibraltar takes his name from a point of land belonging to the English, but he exercises jurisdiction over persons within territory belonging to the Greek Church. Yet it is only over the *Englishmen* who are residing there. So with Bishop Southgate, residing at Constantinople. He was an American Bishop, residing within the limits of the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople. But he claims and exercises jurisdiction over no territory, but simply and only over American citizens residing there.

In the latter case, the object is purely missionary—the improvement of the Church as it now exists, and has been in existence there, ever since St. Andrew

first preached the Gospel to that people. But with regard to the British Bishops mentioned above, the fact that occasioned the necessity of the anomaly is urged as its only justification, namely, that the Church in those places was so corrupt that the English Church could not recommend or willingly permit her members to commune with it. For this reason an English Chaplain is permitted by the English Church to hold services according to her Liturgy within the very walls of Rome itself. Yet in all these cases, she neither claims jurisdiction over, nor pretends to provide for any but her own children in their temporary wanderings from their home.

The same adherence to this principle is seen in our course toward Texas. While it was considered a part of Mexico, we took no measures to send missionaries there, or to establish a Church like our own. But so soon as it came to be regarded by our government as an independent nation, our missionaries, with a truly Apostolic zeal, and with the approbation and support of our Church, went thither to establish the Gospel in the newly erected republic. And until the Annexation of Texas, they were regarded as *foreign* Missions. But now they are placed on the list of "Domestic Missions," and may become a Diocese and enter into the General Convention, whenever they choose to do so, and can comply with the Constitution and Canons of our Church.

The application of this principle, which is thus seen to be established, no less by the Scriptures than by the recognition and practice of all Churches and Sects, is serviceable to us in many ways.

1. In the first place, others settled in some places in the United States, as their limits were in 1783, before the Church of England had made a settlement in those particular places, as the Puritans in Massachusetts, the Dutch Reformed in New York, the Quakers in Pennsylvania, etc., etc. Yet, inasmuch as these were but parts of the *country* in which the Church of England was established before those Sects, her claim would not be prejudiced or precluded by their settlements, even admitting them to be Branches of the Church of Christ.

The Roman Catholics settled in the State of Maryland before the members of the Church of England settled in that State, though not until twenty-six years after the English settlement in Virginia. This gave to the English Church settlement priority of claim over the Romish in this country.

But in regard to all these settlements, the Romish—the Congregational—the Dutch Reformed, etc., etc., it is to be observed that they were in what was then, or soon after became, territory belonging to the English Crown, and therefore within territory which the English Church had a right to occupy, before the Revolution of 1776; nay, was bound to occupy and provide for as soon as she could.

2. But again. Since the organization of our Government, we have acquired territory that was occupied before our acquisition of it, as for instance, Louisiana, Florida, and parts of Mexico. In these territories Churches of the Roman Obedience had made a settlement, and though there was no independent or Pro-

vincial Church in any of those territories, yet the Roman exercise of jurisdiction was established there. Belonging as they did to Spain, to France and to Mexico, nations in which the Churches are in the Roman Obedience, those Churches had a right to extend their communion within their borders.

But when those tracts of country became united to, and incorporated with, the United States, the Christians there ought to have come into the communion of the Protestant Episcopal Church—that being the Branch of Christ's Visible Church holding jurisdiction in this country. And if the Churches in the Roman Obedience had not departed from their original purity, and assumed an attitude of schismatic opposition to the rest of the Church, these members would undoubtedly have come into union with us. And their neglect or refusal has given us a right to regard as null and void their jurisdiction, since their admission to the Union: and to extend our communion into the very places where theirs was before established. We do not become schismatics thereby. On the contrary, they are the schismatics for refusing communion and unity with those with whom, by the Providence of God, and in accordance with the Scriptures, and the principles of the Catholic Church, they ought to be perfectly united.

I am aware that I may be asked if I should give the same advice in a reversal of the circumstances of the case. It is said to be a bad rule that will not work both ways.

But to this I say, in the first place, that the errors

of the Romish Church have no right to exist at all, nor be encouraged anywhere, and therefore their existence is no valid objection to any rule or principle, whose operations would lead to evil results in consequence of the existence of those errors.

In the second place, I remark, that no case has yet occurred in which a portion of country in which a Reformed Branch of the Church had canonical jurisdiction, has been brought under the jurisdiction of a Papal country in temporal things. But if such a thing should happen, I could of course no more recommend the inhabitants of the conquered territory to conform to the peculiarities of Popery, than I could encourage or recommend those now living in Papal countries to conform to them. We must always obey God rather than man; and we are obeying man only, when we yield, even to those that have lawful authority over us, obedience in those things which they have no right to teach and command.

But finally, I may be permitted to avow my belief, that God in his Providence, will never permit any Papal nation to extend its dominion over one in which a purer Branch of the Church exists. If we look at the Papal nations now existing, whether we consider the South American Republics on our own continent, or the kingdoms of the old world, France, Spain, Austria, Italy—we shall see but very little to encourage the belief that there are any of them likely to subjugate any of the Protestant nations. Where is there one that could for a moment cope with Great Britain or the United States? Alas! they are hardly able to

sustain themselves, crumbling in fact with their own weight, and rent with internal feuds and commotions. In these things we can hardly fail to see the hand of Providence. "Verily there is a God that judgeth in the Earth."

But if a nation in the Roman Obedience should thus extend itself it could be only a political extension; it could not be ecclesiastical. And the Law of the ancient Church would stand in force; each nation so far as the Church is concerned is a separate and independent Province.

If, now, we can fix our attention upon the facts and principles that have been brought before our minds in the foregoing sections long enough to see their full force and bearing, I think we cannot fail to see, that it is as certain that the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States is the Church of Christ for the people of this Union, throughout its whole extent, and in all its parts, as if no ages of darkness and corruption had intervened between us and the Apostles, and no Sects had arisen claiming the Christian name. This communion, therefore, is the Church of Christ in and for the people of this nation—identical for all the purposes that immediately concern their eternal interests with that Church which is spoken of in the Scriptures. It is a branch of the Original Vine duly articulating with the parent stalk and thereby connected with the root.

The only difficulty in identifying the Church, as I said at the outset, results from the lapse of ages, and the vicissitudes of fortune through which it has to be

traced. In some histories it may be concealed by the overshadowing importance conceded to the secular concerns of the age. Passions, prejudices, and sinister designs, have also had their influence in diverting attention from the naked and controlling facts in each important epoch. My aim has been to bring these facts distinctly forward—shutting out from our view, for the time, all others, that these might be the more justly estimated in their bearing upon the main and all-involving conclusion. I do not mean to say that the Church has not in some ages been very corrupt, that it has not been, at times, greatly at fault in its treatment of its members. But my main points are to identify the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States, as an outward and visible institution, with the Church of which we read so much in the Scriptures, and to show that it has not lost its character or importance in a spiritual point of view, by anything that has transpired in its past history.

The Scotch Church (not the Establishment, for that is a Presbyterian affair), and the Irish Church, are in full and free communion with the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

But neither of these Churches, nor any that are in communion with them, recognize as parts of the visible Church of Christ, any of the Sects enumerated in a preceding Chapter, or any others that have arisen since the Reformation. Neither of them will receive the members of those denominations to communion by letter, or on certificate of membership, from them. And both the English Church and our own have laid

down a condition that excludes their ministers from being received as ministers by us until they shall have been ordained anew, by our Bishops.

But this is not the attitude which these Churches have taken towards the other parts of the Visible Church. Between us and the Oriental Churches there is free communion and full recognition, notwithstanding some important differences in doctrine, discipline, and worship, they remaining where they were at a period somewhat later than that which we have taken for our standard. We also receive both members and ministers of the Roman Communion to the same standing in ours, on a distinct renunciation of those points in which that communion differs from our standards, and a profession of agreement and conformity to ours. Thus we admit the Churches in the Roman Obedience to be true, though corrupt, Churches of Christ.

The Roman practice toward us has been variant. They use certain rites in Baptism, Confirmation, and Ordination, which are omitted by us, and to which some of their members attach a great importance. For this reason they have sometimes admitted the validity of our Baptisms and Ordinations, and at others denied it. Thus though they admit the validity of baptisms by *unordained* persons in their own communion, yet they usually regard as unbaptized those persons whom they can succeed in perverting from ours. The validity of our ordinations was admitted until some years after Elizabeth's accession to the throne of England. But latterly it has been almost uniformly denied by them, as we have seen in the

chapter on the Church of England since the Reformation.

It may be thought by many that this is a reason why we should disclaim all alliance with them, and class ourselves at once with the Protestant Sects. But this cannot be done. A sister may become a harlot, and her disgrace may change the nature and manifestations of our obligations to her; but she is our sister still. We cannot deny that the same mother bore, and the same father begat, both us and her. Others may be more worthy of our love, but neither this fact, nor any other, can change the relations which not ourselves, but the allotment of Providence has formed between us.

In our Church each Diocese has a convention or council consisting of its Bishop, the clergy actually engaged in ministerial duty, and Delegates chosen by the people of the parishes. The chief Synodical authority consists in the General Convention. This body holds its sessions once in three years, and is composed of all the Bishops, and four Clerical and four Lay Deputies from each Diocese.

It may be expected that I will not pass by without notice, a matter of so much importance in this connection, as the doctrinal character and teaching of that Body which we have identified as the Church of Christ for this country.

It is obvious that a consideration of this matter does not come within my plan, and is not necessary to its completion. I will, however, make a few general statements on the subject.

The first point that I shall mention in this connection, is the declaration in the VIth "Article of Religion," that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." And by the VIIth Article, the Church declares that the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds are to be retained—for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture.

I have, in fact, already, in the foregoing pages, repeatedly stated, that the Reformed Branches of the Church returned to the Scriptures as the only standard of Divine Truth—the only authority by which anything can be proved to be obligatory upon man, as the commandment of God.

While, however, the Church in this country acknowledges no other source of divine knowledge than the written Word of God, she claims, in all cases of doubtful interpretation or construction, the right to interpret and construe that Word for herself. And in doing this, she professes to be guided by the earliest and most prevalent construction.

The possession and exercise of this authority, I have justified from the Scriptures, as well as from the necessity of the case.

The inevitable inference is, that we are bound to look to the Church as in some sense and to some extent our teacher and guide, under God, in things pertaining to Religion.

This principle modifies our duty and our course to a considerable extent. The teaching of the Church becomes thereby an important item for our consideration in our investigation of truth. Hence, in practice, if we find the Church teaching, or holding any thing contrary to our view of the Scripture doctrines—we may not lightly dismiss the Church testimony. It is of more importance to us, than the opinion of any one man. Its doctrinal standards are the result of the wisdom and knowledge of the Scriptures possessed by a large number of men who have probably no superiors living in these respects. They have, moreover, stood the test of many hundred years of experience and discussion. And besides this, the authority necessary to the maintenance of its integrity and discipline, confers upon the doctrines of the Church an importance that is not to be lightly esteemed.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE IDENTITY OF SPIRIT.

MY plan might now be regarded as having been completed. But as no identification of the Body—the outward and visible existence of the Church—can be entirely satisfactory which wholly omits the consideration of the identity of the Spirit, I will devote a few words to that subject.

Every organized society may be regarded as having a certain spirit of its own ; not merely what the French call an “*esprit de corps*,” but a state of mind and feelings produced by their association and the pursuit of the common object which they have in view. We see this among the Masons—among the Presbyterians—among the members of a Temperance Society, and, indeed, among every society or association of men. There is a feeling of interest in the affairs and history of the society, and in each of its members—a zeal and promptness in denying unfounded calumnies, and in apologizing for undeniable faults and mistakes ; a sympathy of feeling that produces a general similarity in the state of mind and heart among all the members.

This holds true with much greater force in the

Church, for that is a society designed for special spiritual purposes, and a supernatural agency has been promised to all its members—to make them to be all “of one heart and one mind”—to renew and transform them into a likeness with our Blessed Lord. The identity of spirit, therefore, must be an object that can be easily distinguished and traced by its outward forms and manifestations.

St. Paul says: “There is one Body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all.”¹

It is quite probable that when St. Paul says “there is one Spirit,” he refers by these words to the third Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost. There is one Body—the Church; and one Spirit—the Holy Ghost. He is in the Church, and the Church would be apostate without him. And the difference in their spiritual condition, between Christians and those who are not, is the fruit and operation of the Holy Ghost in and upon their hearts.

The existence of genuine piety, which may be considered as the spirit of the Church—being the effect and influence of the Holy Ghost—does most unquestionably imply the renewal of the heart; and without such a change in man it cannot exist.

We may refer to a variety of manifestations, or tests of the identity of spirit, and to their existence in various ages and branches of the Church as proofs of identity in them all. Observance of the moral precepts—

¹ Eph. iv, 5, 6.

the duties of good citizenship, and of good neighborhood—meekness, humility, quietness, temperance, sobriety and truth—may all be regarded as fruits of the Spirit; and hence these things, or at least a tendency to them, and an approval of them, must be found in all the Branches of the Church.

I shall at present, however, refer to only a few tests, of the identity of spirit, as being not only satisfactory, but the most convenient of application.

If we look at the present condition of the various branches which we have identified as being parts of the one Catholic Church, or at its past history, we shall doubtless find much to excite emotions of one kind or another, according to the spirit by which we ourselves are actuated. We shall see much zeal and suffering for the cause of Christ. We shall see also much ignorance—much corruption—much superstition—much depravity—much, in short, to love and admire—much to censure and condemn, as well as much to pity and bewail.

All this we may admit as matter of fact and of history. And it will excite various emotions in different classes of individuals, according to the spirit by which they are actuated. Now, the Sects will undoubtedly be inclined to represent the corruptions in the Church to have begun at as early a period as possible—to exaggerate them, and to speak of them in as strong language of condemnation as the subject will bear. This is a part of their justification for their existence as Sects.

On the other hand, a Churchman, one who recog-

nizes in himself a member of that same Church in which these corruptions are represented to have prevailed, will be disposed to extenuate, and as far as truth and candor will allow, to draw the veil of charity—"for charity covereth a multitude of sins"—over their errors and faults. He will feel towards the reputation of the Church as a Puritan in this country does towards the history of the English Non-conformists—as the Presbyterians do towards that of Calvin, and the Presbyterians on the Continent of Europe—as the Masons of the present day do towards the past history of their institution.

Now, as a general thing, the Sects which we have enumerated in a foregoing chapter, do, as a matter of fact, consider the Church to have become corrupt at a very early age—much earlier than the members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, or the members of the Church in any other country, will admit that it became corrupted in any important point. The members of these Sects also represent the extent and influence of those corruptions as much greater than any branch of the Church has admitted.

Undoubtedly there is an extreme on both sides to which we may run. I do not now undertake to say that the Church-people in this country have not gone to one extreme; nor that the Sects on the other hand have gone to the other. I refer only to the fact that they tend in different directions and *towards* opposite extremes.

No special proof of this assertion, I presume, will be demanded or expected. The matter is obvious to

all men. The Sects universally reproach the Episcopalians with making tradition—which is but the testimony, opinions, and usages of the Church—a joint Rule of Faith with the Scriptures—of looking with a blind reverence to the past, instead of sympathizing with the improvements of the age. It is thought that we do not condemn and reject the errors of Rome and the Oriental Churches with sufficient decision, and we are accused of inclining towards them.

If we look behind these outward acts to the motives from which alone they can have proceeded, we shall find, in one case, a partiality for the Church, and in the other, a disposition to disparage it; though those who are actuated by the last named motive, may be unconscious to themselves of any such feeling. But without it, most certainly they would not be disposed to exaggerate the faults of the Church.

None of the Sects, I believe, have any Holy Days for the commemoration of the Apostles and Martyrs, by whose blood, no less than their lives, the infant Church was nurtured and made strong. They pay but little regard to the decisions and Canons of the early Councils or to the early Liturgies and Creeds. Many of them know nothing at all of these things, and do not appear to care to know anything about them. The sufferings of the early Martyrs and Confessors interest them less, and apparently excite less sympathy in their minds, than the labors, privations, and persecutions of the founders and early fathers of their own Sects.

I refer to this obvious difference between the Prot-

stant Episcopal Church on the one hand, and the Protestant Sects on the other—a difference which, so far from being denied by any body, is a matter of boast on both sides, and a matter with which each in turn reproaches the other—as proving that they are actuated by a different spirit in this particular. And, without going into the question of right and wrong in the case, I say that the difference shows where the *Church-spirit* or the spirit of the Church is. The Protestant Episcopalians may go only to the just and the justifiable extent of brotherly love in this matter, or they may have gone to the extreme, and be justly censurable for the abuse of that sentiment. But which view soever be taken of this peculiarity of the Churchmen in this country, in either case it shows where the sentiment exists, and where it does not.

I have said that there will be a sympathy and sentiment of brotherly love among the members of the Church as a consequence of their common experience, common hopes, and common interests. The cultivation of this sentiment is also represented as a duty. “Let brotherly love continue.”¹ And our Saviour has made it a test whereby we may know who are his disciples: “By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.”²

This sentiment, however, will not extend merely to the members of our own parish, nation, or age; but it will embrace the whole fellowship of the Church—the whole family of Christ. Those whom he has re-

¹ Heb. xiii, 1 : Rom. xii, 10 : 1 Thess. iv, 2 : 2 Pet. i, 7.

² John xiii, 35.

ceived throughout the past ages of the Church, and in the different nations where it exists, are our brethren. Or if not, the fault is in *our* position, and not in theirs. The time has now gone by when *they* could be unchurched. If, therefore, *we* are in the Church, they are our brethren in Christ, and the sentiment of brotherly love, if it be genuine, will extend towards them, and we shall cultivate it if we discharge the whole of our duty. We are not left to select for ourselves who shall be our brethren in our spiritual, any more than in our natural, relations. And we must have sufficient self-denial to receive and acknowledge whomsoever Christ has received into the fellowship of his Church, however different our tastes and preferences might have made the selection if the making of it had been left to ourselves.

I refer then to this sentiment which is manifested towards what is known and acknowledged to have been the Church of Christ in ages past, as proof of identity of spirit between the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, and the Church of the Fathers, the Apostles, and Martyrs.

It will be understood that I am not pointing out the course that ought to be taken; or suggesting a direction in which we may go, without going to a vicious extreme, or amiss from the right way. Doubtless we should not deny that errors and corruptions have prevailed in the Church. Nor should our sympathy for those whom we must acknowledge to be brethren, lead us to imitate their faults. But even if this sentiment leads, or has led to this abuse, its existence is

none the less on that account an evidence of the main point of our present subject—the identity of spirit manifested in what may be called a partiality for the Church—in all of its affairs and its history—a disposition to extenuate, rather than to condemn—to throw the veil of charity over faults, rather than expose them to the scoffs and sneers of the infidel and the profane—to treat them, in short, as we do the faults of our brethren in the flesh—faults which are too obvious to be denied, and yet too painful to be spoken of when it can be avoided.

Now there is no doubt which of these two opposite courses the Protestant Episcopalians in this country take. There is no more doubt which of the two the Protestant Sects take. And the adherents to the Roman See are, in fact, fast taking sides with the Sects in this matter. Their avowal of the doctrine of development, including a right on their part to decree new articles of Faith, and to depart from the doctrines and usages of the Fathers—is a manifestation of the same sentiment as that by which the Sects are actuated, though in a different form. And so far as it extends it shows that the spirit of sectarianism and not the spirit of the Church, is prevailing among them.

Unquestionably there are positive Institutions and outward tests in Christianity; and without them one great object of our call to the Christian state is lost. A leading design in the introduction of Christianity to the world was, that men, by the observance of these Institutions and tests on earth should habituate them-

selves to self-denial and self-control, and to the continued yielding up of their wills, so that they may do the will of another, and acquire, by religious discipline and experience in this state of their being, with the help of the Holy Ghost, that holy, and to us, second nature which may fit us for the society and employment of the souls of the just made perfect.

Hence the training which carefully observes the outward and positive Institutions, is a part of religion as essential in itself considered as the inward experience of renewal and peace.

And these outward Institutions are a better test of our conversion, and the genuineness of our piety than the inward emotions ; since they bring us at once and directly into connection with what God has ordained *for us*. Hence they are the test whether *we* will obey him or not.

When a man changes his opinions and course of life with sobriety and emotion, he may be said to be converted. But not every conversion is a *turning to the Lord*. Each sect and each imposter calls the embracing of his or their peculiar views "conversion." Hence we hear of converts to *Millerism*, to *Mormonism*, to *Popery*, and sometimes to *Mahometanism*. All such changes are attended with much emotion, and are regarded by those who are the subjects of them, no less than by those to whom they are converted, as a light and joy from above—the fruit of the Holy Spirit. And if we appeal to the consciousness of the individuals themselves as the test, we shall be in danger of finding what may be regarded as the best

evidence only there, where the fanaticism is the most unmingled and unrelenting in its hold upon its victim.

There must, therefore, be some objective test; and surely there can be nothing better than the regard paid to the Word and Institutions of God. One may be converted to the peculiarities of a Sect, and show no more regard for what is really divine than he did before, and the inward confidence which his experience has inspired may be a perfect shield against the truth itself.

It is a little remarkable, perhaps, that the Scriptures contain the word "*piety*" only once;¹ but righteousness is described as "walking in all the statutes and ordinances of the Lord blameless."²

The Church itself is indeed a divine institution. But it includes within itself, and for the observance and regard of its members, several others—the Scriptures, the Ministry, the Lord's Prayer, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, etc.

I do not mean to discuss at length, in this place, the nature, design or importance of these sacred institutions. I refer only to the sentiment manifested toward them by different classes of individuals for the purpose of identifying the spirit.

I am well aware that there are many who, in this day, refer to these inward emotions, which they call piety and which are the result of what they call "conversion" as the only essential thing in religion; and hence they hold that he that has these feelings has all that he needs, and is sure of God's favor and the final sal-

¹ 1 Tim. v, 4.

² Luke i, 6.

vation of his soul, and that without them he is no Christian.

But the more thorough study of the history of man and of the nature of the human soul, which have occurred in these latter years, have thrown a new light on this subject. These "pious emotions" are, doubtless, *religious* emotions; and they are the result of fixing the thoughts upon God, or what is called God. But they are by no means peculiar to the religious experience of Christians. Every form and variety of religion has something of the kind. The Buddhists excel in them. Even the devil worshipers of Persia get up an excitement of the feelings which they do not doubt, and cannot be made to doubt, is genuine religion—a sign of the favor and approbation of the beings whom they worship.

I think that these considerations have satisfied the men who have given a fair amount of attention to them, that we must have some other test—some outward test. And for this purpose nothing can be better than the divine institutions which our Lord established.

To make my investigation complete I ought to refer to the past, and show that the Church has always, in all ages, been characterized by a high regard to these Institutions. But we have neither time nor space to go into a discussion of that kind. I will, therefore, merely say, that those who have been found to be Sects by the outward indications of history, now, and in all ages past, accuse and have accused Churchmen of superstition and formality on account of the high

estimation in which they hold these Institutions. These charges against the Protestant Episcopalians in this country have doubtless been heard by all persons.

It is the well-known tendency of love to magnify—if that be possible—the importance of its object, and, at any rate, to exaggerate rather than disparage whatever is connected with, or has proceeded from it.

Now, there is no doubt that our Lord did institute a Ministry—that he gave his Disciples, at their request, a Prayer—a Form of Prayer—that he instituted the Sacrament of Baptism to be received by all who should be converted to him, and in which he also himself, was declared from heaven to be the son of God—and the Sacrament of his Last Supper, by which his people are to show forth his death until his coming again. Most intimately, and most unquestionably, therefore, are these things connected with him. And they were instituted by that Spirit which produces the unity and identity of spirit in the Church.

How, then, will genuine piety dispose us to regard these Institutions? I speak not now of erroneous views concerning them: nor of the superstitions of the past and present ages which have exalted the inventions of man, and the cunning devices of the designing, into an estimation of equal importance with those Institutions which God has most certainly ordained. But is it not the tendency of genuine piety, of pure and unfeigned love, to place too high an estimation upon what God has ordained—if that be possible—rather than to disparage it? There may be extremes on both sides, and the best of sentiments may

be abused. Yet the abuse shows the existence of the sentiment. The *abuse* of the sentiment now in question, is manifested in an *over* estimate of these Institutions. Its *absence*, on the contrary, is manifested by holding them in a light estimation and in a disposition to omit or neglect their observance altogether, as unimportant.

Now the Church has always held them to be means of grace, and ordinances whose observance is conducive to salvation. The Sects, on the contrary; generally regard this view of them as a dangerous superstition.

If we love him who founded the Church and gave to it its Institutions, we cannot fail to venerate and esteem them very highly in love for his sake. If there were any doubt or reason to distrust their connection with him, it might, indeed, be superstition to bestow upon them the regard with which piety embraces them when they are ascertained to be genuine. The feelings of piety and love, and gratitude, and self-devotion, awakened in the renewed heart by the consideration of what the Saviour has done for us, flow out toward these Institutions, in which he comes nigh unto us and is present with our souls.

It rests upon the undoubted word of God that many will fail to enter into his heavenly rest on account of their unbelief. But there is neither caution nor warning in all the Holy Scriptures against esteeming too highly, or loving with too ardent a zeal, anything which our Lord has instituted or commanded. There is no intimation that such a thing is possible. The

Lord loved the Church and gave himself for it: our highest glory is to be like him.

Again. The Church has always shown a preference for worship with a stated Liturgy, and such was the mode of worship in which our Saviour himself engaged while he was here in the flesh. It is equally certain and equally admitted that the Church has always been disposed to regard Baptism as a saving ordinance—that it has always manifested a disposition to a frequent administration and reception of the Lord's Supper, and that Daily Prayer in the Sanctuary, morning and evening, has been felt to be both a privilege and a duty. Through all the vicissitudes of the Church's history, and throughout all its branches—amidst all the diversities in other matters—we find an identity of spirit manifested in these respects.

Whether we look at the centuries when the Disciples of the Lord had to creep stealthily before the light of day should facilitate their detection, to dens and caverns in the earth there to chant their praise to Christ, their God, and renew their vows, and refresh their souls in the commemoration of the Last Supper, or whether we consider the oppressed remnants of the Greek Church, scarcely permitted by their Mahometan oppressors to meet in the most obscure and unpretending hovel, made a Sanctuary indeed by the presence of their God with them, or whether we look to the magnificent Cathedral and splendid pageantry of the more prosperous branches of the Church in the West, or, in fine, to the chaste simplicity and subduing grandeur of the reformed Ritual—throughout the

whole, from first to last, and in all the parts, and amidst all other diversities, we find a unity and identity of spirit manifested toward those acts of piety and faith. Combined with superstitions, as it sometimes has been—and shining forth, as it sometimes does, from amidst errors and corruptions, perversities and abuses, that make us weep for the dishonor done to the Christian name—yet as tested by its regard for these institutions, an identity of spirit throughout the whole history of the Church is too conspicuous to be mistaken even by the most careless reader.

The Sects, on the contrary, very generally prefer worship with an extemporaneous prayer. It is thought that a stated Liturgy is a great hindrance to the manifestations of the spirit among them. Their piety is better promoted without than with a stated Form of Common Prayer.

Another point intimately connected with this subject, and indeed forming a part of it, is derived from the regard which the Church has always paid to certain days on which the most important events of our Lord's life occurred—his Birth, his Epiphany, his Death, his Resurrection, his Ascension, and the coming of the Holy Ghost. Let it be admitted that there is an uncertainty with regard to the day on which some of them occurred. Yet there is no such uncertainty with regard to the others—the Death, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the coming of the Holy Ghost. Most of the Sects, however, pay no regard to those days. The day on which the Blessed Lord died to save their souls from the bitter pains of eternal

death, comes in the annual round of earthly affairs; they apparently take no pains to identify it; they feel no interest in observing it with appropriate commemorations; they go about their work or their pleasures as if they were no part of the race for which he died. And if perchance they meet with one whose heart is too full of the sad recollections with which the day is associated to "eat any pleasant bread," or to pursue his ordinary vocations in the world, they regard his feelings as superstitious. On these days *their* piety—the spirit that is in them—does not incline them to lay aside all else, to forget all temporal concerns and indulge the feelings that the event of which they are the anniversaries, inspires in the heart of every devout son of the Church.

It is not, however, because the Sects are opposed to commemorations on general principles, for they all have some events in their history which they commemorate—some founders and fathers to whom they look back with veneration. There have been some strange manifestations of this kind. Thus the same people who ordered Christmas to be kept as a *fast*, a day of mourning, can commemorate the "Landing of the Pilgrims" with an anniversary festival. And in general, the Sects show a disposition to impress upon the minds of their members the importance of the principal events and persons in their history, by commemorations, festivities, and rejoicings, just as the Church attempts to impress upon the minds of her members the great events in the history of her origin—the Birth, the Death, the Resurrection, and the As-

cension of her Lord, and the coming of the Holy Ghost.

It is hardly worth the while to attempt here to vindicate the Church against the charge which is brought against it, of superstition and formality in these respects. The fault of superstition, like that of idolatry, consists not in the excess of affection—but in a mistake in regard to its object. It is idolatry to bestow upon that which is not God the honor and glory due to him. It is superstition to bestow upon human devices and the inventions of men, relics and institutions not mentioned in the Scriptures, the regard which genuine piety would bestow upon those institutions not mentioned in the Scriptures, the regard which genuine piety would bestow upon those institutions which have unquestionably proceeded from the Lord himself. Doubtless there has been much of both, superstition and idolatry, in the Christian as well as the Jewish Church. But the spirit which has always and everywhere been manifested in the Church in all of the ages and parts, of which we know anything, cannot be regarded either as superstition or idolatry. The Comforter, which is the Holy Spirit, was promised to be sent *to the Church and to abide with it forever*.¹ This promise must have been fulfilled: for it proceeded from him “whose word shall not return to him void, but shall accomplish that whereunto He sends it.” That, therefore, which has always been held in the Church “*always, everywhere, and by all*,” cannot be contrary to the unity of the spirit, but must have proceeded from the Spirit of God himself.

¹ I John xiv 16,

Now, as there has always been a unity of spirit in the Church, wherever the Church itself has existed—notwithstanding all the corruptions that have prevailed within its pale, and all the misfortunes that have oppressed and disturbed its functions—so among the Sects there is perhaps in one sense the unity of a spirit diverse from that in the Church, yet for the most part there is an almost endless variety of manifestations of spirit among them.

They have, each of them, a distinct standard or test of piety of their own. I need not enter into protracted specifications. Every one has observed the difference between the character of the piety of the Methodists and the Presbyterians for instance: a difference which it would not be easy to characterize in words, but which no person of common sagacity could fail to observe on being acquainted with the religious experience of two individuals belonging to those Sects respectively. But to look at cases which are still more marked. The piety of a Shaker—a Second Advent Believer—a Latter Day Saint—manifests itself in very different ways from that of a Presbyterian, a Lutheran, a Moravian, or a Methodist. And within these Sects themselves, it is also judged by different standards and tests. A Methodist whose piety did not manifest itself by groans and responses in the time of prayer—a Shaker that could not dance, “moving about with extraordinary transport, singing and making a perfect charm”—a Second Advent Believer who did not think that “the time of the end was near” and “the judge at the door,” or a Latter Day Saint who did

not acknowledge the inspiration of Joseph Smith, and the genuineness of the engraved Tables which he claims to have discovered—would hardly be regarded by those Sects respectively as possessed of genuine piety.

Thus each Sect has a spirit of its own, and yet different from that of the Church: a kind of piety peculiar to itself which can be identified as well as the visible existence of the Sect, and which makes up a part of its identity.

So it is in the Church. There is something in the spirit of the devout and intelligent Churchman which science may fail to analyze and words may be insufficient to describe, but which enables us to distinguish him as soon as we become acquainted with him, and wherever we may meet him. There is something in the books of devotion and edification which have been written by Churchmen—aside from all the peculiarities of doctrine—by which we can recognize at once the identity of the spirit. The more eminent and distinguished the members of the different ages and parts of the Church which we take for illustrations, the more conspicuous does this identity of spirit become—the more do they have in common with each other, and the less of the peculiarities of the age and nation. The writings of the early Fathers could be used from our pulpits without presenting any contradiction either in doctrine or in spirit to what is contained in our Liturgy. And the works of Fénelon and A'Kempis, though distinguished members of the Romish Communion, are prized as devotional guides

by all who have sought a practical acquaintance with works of that kind.

I will not here undertake to account for this difference between the Church and the Sects in their regard for the outward Institutions and Ordinances of religion and in their tests of the genuineness of conversion and piety.

Doubtless also there is a danger *within* the Church of a superstitious regard for rites and Sacraments that are unquestionably of divine origin. Christianity is broader and more comprehensive than any one human mind, and while there are those that will attach the chief importance to soundness in the doctrinal and ethical teachings, others of a different mental constitution, will be chiefly impressed with the ritual and Sacraments, as constituting the chief parts of the religion of Christ. And of course such persons may carry this view so far as to omit or neglect the doctrines and the practical duties of the Christian life.

But it is difficult to understand why any persons should disparage institutions and means of grace which they do not doubt that they possess. If they were conscious of being without them, or in a condition to have only the form without the validity and spiritual grace, we should expect them to believe and teach, either as a cause or as a result of their position, that they are of no essential importance.

Again: there is always an advantage, in a sectarian point of view, in making the test of piety, something inward and subjective—for in that case, persons are committed to nothing that is permanent and un-

changeable—but they can always adapt themselves to the inclinations of men, and change from time to time to suit the spirit of the age.

Such differences are there between the spirit that is in the Sects and that which is in the Church. So different is the piety of the two different classes of persons. In all this we doubt not their sincerity, or their good intentions. And I have introduced the subject for no purpose of pointing an argument, or of drawing an unfavorable conclusion against them. I have spoken of it for the purpose of showing that that body, which I have historically identified as the branch of the Church of Christ in this country, claims to manifest, and is accused of manifesting, that sentiment towards the Church—even in regard to its undeniable faults and corruptions—which both nature and Revelation teach us to expect, if there really exists the identity between them which we have traced out; and that its sympathies are with the Church, as tested by its most important Institutions and its most characteristic Observances. And by this train of thought it must appear, as I think—taking the claims of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the accusations of those opposed to it (concurring as they do in this) as the premises from which our conclusion is drawn—that there is an identity of spirit as well as of body clearly traced between the branch of the Church in this country and the original Vine.

Now this identity of spirit—that which has been possessed always, everywhere, and by all in the Church—is the fruit of the Spirit of God in the

Church. And whatever any particular Church has more than this is peculiar to itself, and therefore, not catholic ; and whatever any one may have that is contrary to it, is opposed to Christ.

I think that I have now shown, that if one wishes to perform all the duties commanded in the Scriptures, to enjoy the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, and to have the satisfaction of knowing that he is a co-worker together with God in the work of human salvation, or to give himself up in a life of devotion to him who gave himself for the world, this may be done without fear of mistake or failure, by any of the inhabitants of this Republic, in what is here called the Protestant Episcopal Church. I have pointed out a communion in which my fellow-travelers to eternity may find rest for their souls, with every assurance of the blessings of the Spirit and the enjoyment of the favor of God, which the nature of the case permits us to have. I could easily refer to experience, which attests the existence and reality of all that our course of investigation may have led us to expect. The joy and hope and peace of those who have drunk into her Spirit, are too deep and tranquil to attract the observation of the heedless and noisy. But her "heavenly ways, sweet communions, and solemn vows" are being daily more and more appreciated and sought after ; and wanderers, weary of the turmoil and burthen of the world, or sick of the strifes, the instability, and the ever varying changes of sectarianism, are returning for a home, and for rest, in her bosom.

It is ascertained that out of *fifteen hundred* clergy

in the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, over *three hundred*, or about *one-fifth* have been ministers in some of the other denominations. This was said in 1850 and though I have no means of determining at present, I do not doubt that the proportion is about the same as it was then. Of the clergy in this city who are engaged in actual Church work here, nine in all, four at least have been preachers in other denominations.

One of those who have thus come into the Church thus writes of his change: "My answer to the Dissenter is, who, but a Churchman, that has tasted the great delights of the sanctuary, can appreciate the Church's excellence? My vindication to the Churchman is, who but the soul that has been 'tossed up and down like a locust' upon 'the winds of doctrine' and the sea of Sects, can understand the mazes, the dangers, the under-currents, and the disasters of sectarianism? Sectarrians, you know nothing of the Church's blessings! Churchmen, you know nothing of Sectarrianism's mischiefs!"

The proportion of those now in our ministry who were born and brought up in the other denominations is of course still greater than that of their ministers who have changed, and is in fact estimated at about two-thirds of the whole number.

Of the communicants I presume the proportion is even still larger. Some few years ago I made a calculation and found that while the population of the country, including immigrants, had increased from 1830 to date—1880—that is, in fifty years, at the rate

of 3.46 per cent. per year—the increase in membership of our Church from that time had been a trifle over 6.4 per cent. From this it must be evident that we have gained by the admission of converts to the Church something more than by the natural growth; that is, by the growing up of persons born and bred in the Church: some at all events must have been lost by one means or another, who should have belonged to us by natural descent.

We are in this country thrown upon our merits. The principle of “the struggle for life with survival of the fittest” must apply to Churches as well as to individuals, and in fact all things else. The Church which commends itself the most to the minds of thoughtful and earnest men, is that which they will prefer and it will grow by their preference.

Now one of the points that is exerting this attractive influence is the claim which we present of identity with the original Church which our Lord Jesus Christ founded. And we are largely if not wholly “on our merits” here. We have no State protection to help us—or to hinder us—if that should happen to be the case. We are free from Papacy: but then that institution has its glamour and attractions for minds of a certain constitution. But everybody unless it be the immigrant who comes here under Papal prepossession—considers himself free to examine and make up his mind, or to choose for himself which church he will belong to—or none if that should happen to be his choice.

I have but a few points more to add: The first I

shall remark upon is the relation of the Church to Divine Truth.

This element is very clearly indicated by St. Paul when writing to Timothy. He calls the Church "the Pillar and Ground of the Truth."

By recurring to its history it will be seen that the Church was instituted *before* the Scriptures of Divine Truth were written. We first read of the Church as already in existence on, or immediately after the day of Pentecost, in the common computation A. D. 33. But no portion of the New Testament Scriptures were written until several years after that date. And when they were written it was in the Church and by its members; and they were committed to the Church for use and for transmission.

The whole value of the Scriptures to us depends upon our having them as they came from the pen of inspiration. If any part has been lost the loss is irreparable. If anything has been added to them, or anything changed in their contents, it becomes unsafe to rely upon what we have, as the word of God. Before, therefore, we can make any use of the Scriptures which we now have as an authority for doctrine or for duty, we must identify them with those that were at first given by the inspiration of God.

We may learn from external testimony and from heathen writers, enough to prove that such a person as our Lord lived in Judea at the time designated in the Scriptures—that he taught a new religion and founded a Church, and that *some* Scriptures containing his doctrines were written by his disciples. But

no copies of the Scriptures then written, have been preserved by the Heathen. They are not mentioned by name, enumerated, described, or quoted by heathen writers, so that we can compare the Scriptures which we now have with what was then written. Depending upon this source then, we are but little, if any better off, than as though we did not know that a Bible had ever been written—for we have no means of ascertaining that what we have came from our Lord or his Apostles.

Nor shall we fare much better if we turn from the heathen to the Christian Sects. By their very position, the Sects were incapacitated from being competent witnesses to the genuineness and identity of the Scriptures. For not only their doctrines, but the very step which they had taken, and which brought them into existence as Sects, was condemned by the Scriptures. This they knew and felt. Hence they would be strongly tempted to corrupt the Scriptures, in order that they might bear no testimony against them.

And this is not a mere conjecture of what they might do, and would be likely to do; it is known that they actually did do it. Many spurious works were produced and circulated among the early sects as the works of the Apostles. Some of the genuine works were interpolated and badly corrupted; and others rejected altogether. So that if we were left to depend upon them we could no where find a pure and unadulterated copy of the Scriptures.

On the contrary, all the genuine productions of the Apostles would be received and carefully preserved by

the Church. Their chief desire was to know the truth and the whole truth. They had no temptations to corrupt the writings of the Aposles. Those writings were constantly used in their daily and weekly worship. They were freely and fully quoted in the writings of the Fathers of the Church whose works have come down to us. And it is said, that if the Bible, as a distinct book, were now entirely lost, it could be restored by collecting the quotations made from it in the early Fathers of the Church, and putting them together in a volume. Of course, therefore, by comparing the Bible we now have with what we find there quoted, we can ascertain whether the Bible is precisely the same as it was then: in other words, we can identify our Bible with that of the early Church, and so with that which the inspired Prophets, Evangelists, and Apostles wrote.

Strike out of existence, then, the testimony of the Church and its members, and leave the inquirer to what he can find outside of its pale alone, among heathen writers and outside sects, and it is very doubtful whether he could find a copy of the Scriptures anywhere in existence at all. He certainly could have no satisfactory proof that he was in possession of *all* that had been written for the guidance and instruction of man, by the inspiration of God. He could not know that what he had, is the work of the Apostles and others to whom it is attributed. He could not know but that what we have, has been so grossly corrupted as to be totally unlike what it was when it came from the pen that was guided by inspiration. On the

contrary, knowing as we do how the early sects, the Ebionites, the Gnostics, the Montanists, etc., etc., corrupted the Scriptures, we could not doubt that, if we had only what is derived to us through such sources, that which we might possess would have been so much corrupted as to be no safe guide to practice—no sure ground of hope. But in the Church the Scriptures were first received. By it they have been kept, revered and used. In the early Fathers they were fully and freely quoted, and by this means the Word of God has been kept for us, and we *know* that what we have is the Word of God.

But the value of this testimony depends upon the identity of the Church. If, instead of the testimony of the Church, we should take that of the Ebionites, we should have a corrupt copy of St. Matthew's Gospel, as our only account of our Lord's life, and none of the writings of St. Paul. If we should take that of the Gnostics, we should be without the best proofs of the Divinity of Christ. So with each of the Sects. Did we rely upon their testimony alone, we should have a copy of the Scriptures modified and altered to accommodate and inculcate their errors, instead of the truth as it is in Jesus. But the Church has had neither motives, disposition, nor opportunity to corrupt them. And more than this, we know from history that the Sects did corrupt the copies which they received, and that the Church did not.

But this is not all—these early Fathers, by whose writings we are able to identify the Scriptures, contain such doctrinal statements and discussions as enable us

to see how Christianity was then understood. "The faith once delivered to the saints," was explained to them in all of the Churches founded by the Apostles—that is, in Churches scattered over nearly the whole of the then known world—before they had received the Scriptures at all, and in many cases before any part of them was written. Some formularies, or confessions of faith—"forms of sound words"¹ existed and were in use as bonds of union and baptismal confessions from the very commencement of those Churches. Perhaps no one of these can now be found precisely as it then existed. Yet divers of them do we find in all the Churches founded by the Apostles. They are quoted, discussed, and explained, *as of authority*, in all the earlier writers from Alexandria and Carthage to Byzantium, and from Jerusalem and Antioch to Lyons, in the west. We have also the early Canons of Discipline and the Liturgies of their Worship. We have the writings of Clement, whose name was in the Book of Life,² of Ignatius, the friend and companion of St. Peter, of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, of Tertullian, of Irenæus, of Justin Martyr, of Clement of Alexandrin, of Cyprian, and of Eusebius, who wrote a history of the Church from its foundation to his days, A. D. 325.

Now from these writings we can ascertain how Christianity was understood, what the Scriptures were thought to contain, and how their contents were explained, as well as we can learn from the writings of Calvin and Beza, and the early Presbyterians, how Christianity was understood by them.

¹ 2 Tim. i, 13.

² Phil. iv, 3.

Thus we have an independent testimony, an extraneous witness to the faith once delivered to the saints, coming down to us in the Church from the very age in which the Scriptures were written. It is of course imperfect, but yet sufficient to enable us to identify the Faith as well as the Scriptures. All the salient points and leading doctrines of Christianity are stated with sufficient distinctness. And these writings show that the same system was delivered everywhere : and on all these great and leading points there is a perfect harmony and agreement. They speak of the Faith as a historic thing, which had once been delivered to them, which they must keep and hand down to others ; and not as something which they had invented, or adopted by agreement and compact among themselves, nor yet as something that each individual had been left to discover for himself by his own investigations and the exercise of his private judgment.

And in all the earlier writers, when a question arose concerning any doctrine, or a dispute with the heretics called forth a defense of the truth, the appeal was not as now, to philology, to hermeneutics, to reason and to logic, but to the doctrine, or mode of explaining a doctrine or passage of Scripture which had been preserved in those Churches that had been founded by the Apostles in person, and received an explanation of Christianity from their own living lips.

As a specimen of this kind of reasoning, take the following from Tertullian's *Prescription against Heretics*.¹ "On this principle, therefore, we shape our

¹§ xxi I quote the Oxford Translation of 1842.

rule, that if the Lord Jesus Christ sent the Apostles to preach, no others ought to be received as preachers than those whom Christ appointed. . . . Now what did they preach, that is, what Christ did reveal unto them, I will here also rule, must be proved *in no other way* than by those same Churches which the Apostles themselves founded; *themselves, I say, by preaching to them by the living voice, as afterwards by Epistles.* If these things be so, it becometh forthwith manifest, that all doctrine, which agreeth with these Apostolic Churches, the wombs and originals of the Faith, must be accounted true, as without doubt containing that which the Churches have received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, and Christ from God; and that all other doctrines must be judged at once to be false, which soweth things contrary to the truth of the Churches, and of the Apostles, and of Christ, and of God. It remaineth, therefore, that we show whether this our doctrine, the rule of which we have above declared, be derived from the tradition of the Apostles, and from this very fact, whether the other doctrines come of falsehood. *We have communion with the Apostolic Churches because we have no doctrine differing from them.* This is evidence of truth."

The reasons for this rule, as Tertullian says, are various. In the first place, the Heretics do not receive the entire and uncorrupted Scriptures. But secondly, the Scriptures were never given *to them*: they have no right to the use of them: and without the Scriptures we prove that they have no right to the

Scriptures as an authority for what they do: and finally, by putting a meaning upon them different from that which they were intended to have, they confound and mislead the simple and unlearned, and make the Gospel itself to convey, only at best, an uncertain sound, and people will not know what to believe.

There is a pregnant text to this point in St. Paul's second Epistle to the Thessalonians:¹ "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, *whether by word, or our epistle.*"

When this was written the Thessalonians had no part of the Scriptures except St. Paul's first Epistle to them. They had, however, "the Faith," and were directed to hold that fast even as it had been taught to them orally—"by the living voice," as Tertullian says. Other passages of similar import might be quoted from the New Testament.

But I do not design to dwell on this part of my subject. Different men will of course attach very different measures of importance to this kind of testimony or authority. But call its value what we may, either a controlling and ultimate authority, from which there may be no appeal—or nothing; or place it anywhere between those extremes as we please, *the fact itself*, that we can thus learn from the early records of the Church what was received as Christianity, admits of no denial.

It may be difficult to say precisely to what degree of minuteness we might descend in specifying the points of Christian doctrine, which can thus be proved

¹ 2 Thess. ii, 15.

from the early Fathers to have been delivered to the Church by the Apostles. This much we may say, at least, that man is in a fallen and depraved condition by nature, and needs forgiveness—renewal; that in the unity of the Godhead there are three distinct Persons, the Second of whom was incarnate of the Virgin Mary, suffered as an atonement for us; and that the Third, was sent to sanctify the hearts of them that believe; that thus salvation was freely offered to all men, and all are capable, by the divine grace, of receiving it; that sin and depravity are washed away in Baptism; that the spiritual effects of Christ's incarnation are conveyed to us in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; that a Ministry was established to have charge and oversight of the believers; that respect, obedience and support are due unto them for Christ's sake; that there should be a resurrection from the dead, and a final judgment according to the deeds done in the body.

It is true, indeed, that in these early writings we find nothing on many of the points that now agitate the world with controversies, because those points do not appear to have been thought of or suggested for discussion by any body. But most unquestionably all that is necessary to salvation, *all that has come from God*, was then known; for we can have nothing that was not given to the Christians of that age and has not come down to us through them. And on all the points named above, and a great many more, there is the most perfect harmony and uniformity of teaching in all parts of the early Church—in those that were

the most remote and disconnected from each other, as well as in those that were adjacent and more immediately affiliated.

It is then undoubtedly certain that we are indebted to the Church for the preservation of the Scriptures whole and uncorrupted, and that we must depend upon the Church, and upon that wholly and exclusively, for our certainty that what we have is the Scripture, *as it was* "given by the inspiration of God," the source and fountain of Divine Truth. We are indebted to the Church for the preservation of that which "containeth all things necessary to salvation." And we learn from the Church too, what are the great facts and doctrines which it was understood to contain, and was explained to contain by those who wrote

Was there no moral design in this? Does not this chain of facts give force and significancy to such passages of Scripture as these. "The Church of the Living God, the Pillar and Ground of the Truth!" "Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast learned!" "Stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether by word or our Epistles!" "If he neglect to hear the Church let him be unto thee as an heathen man and publican!"

If, then, it is true that no other Church can certify us of the genuineness and identity of those Scriptures which were at first given by the inspiration of God, and are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; it is no less true, that no other has preserved to us, or could pre-

serve to us, that interpretation which was at first put upon them, and which, if we would be guided into the truth, we must now believe. If there is now a doubt about the Divinity of Christ, the freedom of salvation for all men, the remission of sins in Baptism, the necessity of good works to salvation, the future punishment of the finally impenitent, the three-fold order of the ministry, the necessity of communion in the Church established by our Lord and his Apostles, there was certainly no doubt or uncertainty on these points, "while," in the language of Tertullian, "all were Apostolic, because all were one." These things without the Scriptures can be proved to have been taught by the Apostles "by word," even before the Scriptures themselves were written. And it deserves to be considered by him who would receive and hold "the Faith once delivered to the Saints" whole and undefiled, whether, and if so, when, and on what grounds the command to stand fast and hold the traditions which ye have been taught, "whether by word or by our Epistle," has been abrogated.

Hence no objection to the view which has now been presented of this function of the Church can arise from the corruptions and darkness of the middle ages, or from the present position and claims of the Romish Church. The field is clear, and we can look above the fogs and mists of intervening centuries, take up the writings of the early Fathers just as they left them, and see through them what Christianity was understood to be when it was first committed to Holy Scripture, and "written for our learning."

We claim no value for this early interpretation, on the ground that the men of that age were wiser and holier than the men of this, nor on the ground that they had any special authority binding upon us. But it is simply on the ground that their mode of interpretation, their view of Christianity, their Creeds, in short must have been given on the same authority, and by the same persons, and in most cases earlier in point of time, than the writing of the Scriptures. So that in the language of the profound and cautious Thordike,¹ "it remains that we affirm, whatsoever the whole Church from the beginning, hath received and practiced for the Rule of Faith and manners, all that to be evidently true, by the same reason for which we believe the very Scriptures [to be the word of God]: and therefore, that the meaning of them is necessarily to be confined within those bounds, so that nothing must be admitted for the truth of these which contradicteth the same" ["the Rule of Faith and manners."]

But be this as it may, the fact cannot be denied, and it is nowhere denied, in practice, however much it may be in theory—that what men regard as the Church, is acknowledged to have authority over its members in matters of faith. No member is allowed to contradict anything that is held to be fundamental by any religious society or church, and yet retain his membership. The right of discipline and excommunication is claimed and exercised by all.

Now in the Church this right becomes one of fear-

¹ *Principles of the Christian Truth*, B. I chap. vi, § 1.

ful responsibility and import, for it declares the excluded member to have denied the Faith, whereof alone cometh salvation—it cuts him off from the means of grace, the fellowship of Christ, and unless he repents and is restored, from the hope of salvation. And it is as sure as the Revealed Word of God itself, that what is thus done on earth will be ratified in heaven, unless the Church in so doing has exceeded her authority, and made that to be a term or condition of communion, which is not clearly laid down in the Scriptures as of essential and fundamental importance.

CHAPTER IX.

THE EFFECTS OF SECTARIANISM.

THE Church then, as one Body, and with a united voice, comes, or should come, to every human being, proclaiming to him the Gospel of his Salvation. It comes with the Word of God as a Revelation of his Will: with the Sacraments and with the Creed, containing a brief summary statement of what the Scripture teaches that he ought to believe and do, with fuller explanations of the same truths, in her Canons, her Liturgies, her Offices, and in the Homilies and Sermons of her Preachers. And this each one is authorized and bound to receive as the true meaning and intent of the Scriptures, until he is qualified to look beyond these elementary forms and teachings to the Bible itself, and to the teachings of the Catholic Church while it was undivided, and all of its different branches spake and taught the same thing. And if his branch of the Church brings him no other Creed than that of the Apostles, or that which was agreed in by the whole Church, and no teaching but what is in accordance with that Creed, and the teaching of the Church in its earliest days, I confess I cannot see how

the guilt or the danger of him who rejects any fundamental portion of that teaching, can be less than that of him who rejects a certain portion of the Word of God, because it teaches what he thinks ought not to be found there, and could not be found there if it came from God. In looking at mankind at large, the first and most obvious fact, in a moral point of view that strikes the observer, who is acquainted with the contents of the Scriptures, is that of disobedience. On examination, every sin is found to contain this as the chief element of its guilt. The evils which result, in the ordinary course of consequences, great as they sometimes are, are nothing compared with the fact that the authority of the Supreme Governor, upon whom all things depend, and for all things, is rejected, despised, and trampled under foot. A shock is thus sent throughout the universe—the effect is felt by every created thing.

If we recur to the first sin committed on earth—the transgression in Eden—we shall see that its whole guilt consisted apparently in its being an act of disobedience. So far as we know or can see it had no natural consequences of evil. But it was the exaltation of human pride, the aspiration of human ambition, the disposition to trust in human reason, to the disparagement of the revealed will, or imposed commandments, of God.

And if we look at the dispensations of God to man, we shall derive a lesson of equal importance in relation to our present subject. We have alluded to this part of God's dealing with man in a previous chapter,¹

¹ Chap. I.

and we may as well recur to it in conclusion. We shall not need to repeat here what was said there. From these considerations it is evident that obedience is the cardinal point of our earthly probation, as including all the rest. Each of the prominent relations in life has its precept of obedience. Children are commanded to obey their parents, servants their masters, wives their husbands, citizens and subjects their rulers and governors, and Christians their pastors. Thus the law of obedience is made to run through all the gradations of society. And from the highest Archangel around the Eternal Throne, through each descending link in the scale of being, Angels, Seraphim, Cherubim, Apostles, Prophets, Bishops, Priests and Deacons, down to the humblest individual that waits at the altar, or serves as a doorkeeper in the House of the Lord, there must be order and subordination ; and the duty of obedience from each one to those that are over him in the scale of the Divine appointments, is essential to the stability and harmony of the whole. This obedience implies government and governors in the immediate exercise of authority over us.

The Scriptures, unaccompanied by any interpretation, or interpreted by each individual's private judgment, cannot accomplish their intended result. For, in the first place, but only a very small part of the human race are able, or ever have been able to read and acquire sufficient familiarity with the contents of the Scriptures to be able to know what they teach and require. Many Christians in the world cannot read at all. And a still greater number have no sufficient

amount of leisure to make themselves familiar with all that is contained in the Holy Bible.

But again, the endless diversities in the religious opinions that prevail in the community, show beyond question that without something having authority to intervene between the Scriptures and the private judgment of the individual, there is no possibility of bringing men into obedience to any rule, such as that which is contained in the Scriptures must be, unless they give an uncertain sound and contradict themselves. The diversities do not affect mere doctrines alone, they affect the practice of our religion also ; and the practices which are alleged to have been derived from the Word of God, are as diverse as the doctrines themselves. Some baptize their children ; others consider it wrong to do so. Some think the frequent observance of the Holy Communion good and edifying ; and others pronounce it a more superstition and formality. Some believe that the restitution of what has been wrongfully taken is necessary to the obtaining God's favor when one repents ; others hardly ever think of the thing. Some believe that the tithe, at least, of their income is God's due for the support of his religion ; others are thankful that they can enjoy all the advantages of religion and have it cost them nothing. Some think that a daily service is edifying and no more than is due to the mercy and goodness of God ; others think that once a week is often enough to spend their time in the public worship of God ; and many there are who are not careful to attend the public worship of God, even once on a Sunday.

Now all these views cannot be right. They cannot all be inculcated in the Word of God or derived from it. And most undeniably it is best for each individual to know what is the view that is presented in the Scriptures, and to follow it.

But again, the idea that men may violate the unity of the Church, separate from its communion, and form a church of their own for every opinion which they may honestly and conscientiously hold, is a death-blow to all obedience.

If man were not depraved and corrupt in his nature, it is most certain that he could not honestly and sincerely entertain any view or opinion that is not in harmony with the truth. But it is one of the proofs, as well as one of the worst evils of our fallen condition, that we do sometimes love error rather than truth, and can most honestly and most conscientiously believe that which is not true and righteous.

No fact is more certain, or of a more fundamental importance, than that we need something to go behind even our convictions of right and truth, and bring these very convictions into harmony with that which is really the right and the truth. Undoubtedly "there is a way that seemeth right unto man, but the end thereof are the ways of death."¹ We are not for a moment to suppose that all those who are wandering in the ways of error and unrighteousness are conscious of insincerity and hypocrisy. It is difficult to say whether such an opinion would imply most of uncharitableness, or of a total ignorance of human nature.

¹ Prov. xiv, 12.

No, those who are in error often give the best evidence of sincerity and good intentions. The Prophet speaks of the idolater thus: "A deceived heart hath turned him aside, that he cannot deliver his soul nor say, 'is there not a lie in my right hand?'"¹ Surely he has not duly estimated the fearful import and consequences of the fall of man, who has not seen that it has so deranged his moral and spiritual faculties, as to make necessary some guide and authority out of himself, to reduce great truths to definite and positive statements, great principles to practical precepts, and to speak with dogmatic and commanding authority. We see the necessity for this in the education and government of children. We see it in schools. We see it in our legislatures, and in our courts of civil as well as criminal judicature.

If now man may throw off the regimen or government that God has placed over him, whenever he conscientiously differs from it, there is an end to all government and to all obedience; that is not obedience properly speaking, which conforms, *because* the thing required coincides with the private judgment of him who is to do it. It is only when private judgment is yielded up to an authority duly placed over us, that our act becomes one of obedience, and shows any measure of subjection to the Divine Will. To give alms to a poor person, because his distress excites our compassion, may be indeed a commendable act, but no one would think of calling it an act of obedience. It becomes obedience only when we do it *because* God

¹ Isa. xiv, 20.

has commanded, "be ye merciful because I am also merciful."

Another essential element of obedience is, that it be rendered to the proper authority. Ultimately, it should terminate in God and in his truth. Obedience to parents and to civil magistrates is right, because God has required it. But obedience to one who has usurped the authority which God has given to another is rebellion against him. When the people desired a king to rule over them instead of the corrupt and wicked sons of Samuel—who, nevertheless, were over them as judges, according to the established law of God,—God said unto Samuel, "*they have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me that I should not reign over them.*"¹

Here then we *see* the connection of our subject with the identity of the Church. We have seen that man needs an authority, and God gave such an authority to his Church. It, therefore, is the institution which he has appointed for the moral purpose of promoting obedience. We must be brought into a state of obedience before we can be admitted to the final kingdom and glory of God. The Church is the agent which he has appointed to accomplish this work, and the Bible is the Rule which he has given the Church whereby to be guided in doing it.

But if we may reject this authority and government for every scruple of conscience, every conscientious opinion, we may at any time escape the test proposed. We are under no obedience so long as we may make a

¹ 1 Sam. viii, 7,

matter of conscience of any opinion we entertain, or of any preference we may cherish, and set up a church or authority, that shall direct and govern according to our own opinions and wishes. In that case we make ourselves the masters of the Universe, and the government or Church becomes but the reflection of the volitions of our own will.

And here is the broad difference between the Church and all forms of Sectarianism. The one represents unto us the authority and will of God, and the other reflects but our own. Hence there may be as many sects as there are classes of opinion and preferences—and a form of error adapted to the weakness and peculiar susceptibilities of each individual, that so he may find something that he will like better, and on the whole prefer, to that which he ought, for his soul's health, to receive. Is not this the meaning of that saying of St. Paul, "*For there must also be heresies among you, that they which are approved may be made manifest among you.*"¹ In our country Popery appeals to the imagination, to the love of pomp and show, and of arbitrary rule. Presbyterianism appeals to that element which has always inclined men to fatalism, and a comfortable conviction concerning oneself, as one of the elect, combined with a belief that the character and fate of others was foreordained and cannot be helped. Methodism appeals to that species of excitement and enthusiasm which regards "the fervor of the animal sensibilities"² as religion. And so of

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 19.

² I use the words of Bishop White.

all the forms of error around us. They make the command "deny thyself, take up thy cross daily," to be of none effect. They exhibit to each individual some form of religion which he may embrace without this painful and humiliating duty. If he does not find religion what he wants it, he may turn reformer and present it to the world in any form that he may choose.

Now it is but an insane folly to suppose that such a system can bring men "in the unity of the Faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." No: we need something to meet us in God's name at every step and turn in our lives, and with authority to give us his precepts and directions, until we are trained and *habituated* to that perfect resignation of our own wills, that perfect obedience, which is the distinguishing characteristic of the angels in heaven, and was the crowning glory and charm in the life and character of our blessed Lord on earth.

Hence it is necessary to have the representatives of the Divine authority always present in the form of a living and personal agent. And not only so, but even the human infirmities and imperfections of the minister may be turned to our advantage. The perfect subjugation of every thought and wish to the law of Christ, can be more surely and speedily effected when the path through which he calls us to walk is attended with trials and hardships which it grieves our unsanctified natures to bear.

But if all this self-renunciation and voluntary humil-

iation and submission be rendered to that which we have put in the place of God—some idol set up in our hearts—or some government which we have erected in the willfulness of our unsubdued hearts, and put into the place of that which God has placed over us ; then we do indeed take up a cross, but it is not the cross of Christ ; and we make a sacrifice, but it is not upon the Altar of the true and only God : and we obey, but our obedience is not rendered to him whose right it is to reign on earth as in heaven.

We have seen that the identity of the Church, that is, the Church itself, is intimately connected with the highest interests of man. We present evidence of that identity. Our evidence is addressed to the understanding and to the conscience, for the purpose of inducing an exercise of belief, and leading us to put our trust in that which we allege to be the Church in this country, for all the purposes for which the Church itself was designed.

Nor can we deny that the evidence in these cases, or in any other in which God requires us to believe anything, or has attached any importance to our believing or doing it, is sufficient to throw the responsibility upon us, and make unbelief itself a sin. There is such a thing as insufficient evidence ; and in all such cases unbelief implies no moral fault, no guilt on the part of him who withholds his assent, and each one is left to his own discretion or choice. But in all the cases mentioned, the Messiah, the Bible, the Church, everything in regard to which God has given us any commandment, or made any requisition upon us—the

amount of evidence is just what God himself has seen fit to give us. To say then that he has not given us evidence enough to produce conviction—unless we ourselves willfully and wickedly interpose some obstacle—“set up some idol in our hearts, or put the stumbling block of our iniquity before our faces”—is either to accuse him of injustice or to impeach his omniscience. It implies, either that he did not know what evidence would be sufficient, or that he has required us to believe under circumstances, when the best, the wisest, and the healthiest exercise of the faculties he has given us, would be unbelief.

Now all this is as applicable to the Church as to the Scriptures, or to the Messiah himself.

It is an institution concerning which, as we have seen, God has given us commandments, and made requisitions upon us, and with which he has connected many and precious promises. It must be admitted, therefore, that he has given us the means and opportunities of doing what he thus requires; and among these, first and foremost, is sufficient evidence of the identity of that Church with which these commands, requisitions, and promises are connected.

If the evidence is not in itself sufficient, it is the fault of him whose province it was to furnish the evidence. It implies that God did not know what would be sufficient, or could not furnish it, or finally, that he was so unjust, to say nothing of his love and mercy, as not to do what he could, and what he knew to be just and necessary.

Hence the Church must be an object of faith, and a

test of our obedience to God. It has always been so, and such it always must be. We can have no direct intuition, no direct supernatural communication as to the fact. Even in the days of our Lord and the Apostles, when miracles were wrought and supernatural gifts conferred, the Church was an object of faith. If Christ was the Son of God, if the Apostles were truly such, if the miracles were genuine, there was indeed no room to doubt that the society and fellowship of the Disciples was the Church and the kingdom of God. But these premises, each of them, were objects that tried the faith of the people of that age.

Perhaps I cannot better conclude this work, than by some reflections upon the effects of the present divided state of Christendom.

The existence of so many sects or denominations is, from one point of view, at least, an immense evil. And there is no wonder that there is a cry and a demand for union.

But the existence of these sects or denominations is not wholly an evil. Or at least there is a hopeful side to it. Or, at all events, we may take an optimistic view of the subject and see how God is bringing good out of the evil.

Our population are of a very mixed character. They have come together from almost all the nations of the earth. And, doubtless, the beliefs and usages, which their ancestors may have been accustomed to in other lands, are a powerful means of influence, even in religious matters. The masses of people do not, and cannot, wholly change, in one generation at least, their

beliefs and usages. It is well that they cannot. Our safety depends upon it in more ways than one. We change for the better only as we grow up to the change.

In looking at the mass of our population, in one direction, as we see them in this country, around us and in our midst, it is very doubtful whether they could be kept up to a fair amount of purity and temperance without compulsory confession. Nor does it seem that these masses could be kept in order and submission to our laws if it were not for the authority of their Priests. And it is doubtful, if even the Priests could do much in this direction, if they were not backed up by the Pope and the belief in his supremacy.

And something to the same effect, although of quite a different character, may be said of another large section of our population. They have been brought up, here or in their native country, where the idea of the Church was not one that they had imbibed in the early vocabulary of their domestic lives. Many of them—nay, multitudes of them—had gone from the idea of the Church into that of sectarianism, and thence into unbelief and irreligion. With regard to these persons, it often happens that sectarian preachers have shown special facilities for reaching them that we have not.

God's ways are often mysterious, and he who sees the end from the beginning often leads his people by a way that they know not to results which are in the end, and when we can look upon them as in the past, seen to be good, and possibly results such as could have been attained in no other way. The nations

have much—very much—to learn before they are prepared for the Advent, and the Millenium that most Christians expect in the future. There are always some things that apparently need to be done, which a conscientious and well informed Christian man may well hesitate to undertake. But then, there are always men who have no such scruples. They are often men whom we greatly admire and regard as far superior to ourselves in all kinds of moral excellence. But they see things in a different light from ourselves, and enter upon work that we could not undertake. And then, too, sometimes, the men who engage in such works are selfish, ambitious, unscrupulous—men for whose moral character we can have no respect. And yet God makes use of them for the accomplishment of his purposes.

This principle of God's moral government is very distinctly enunciated by the Prophet Isaiah (x, 5-8), "O Assyrian, I will give him charge to take the prey, to tread down nations like the mire in the streets. Howbeit *he meaneth not so, neither doth his heart think so*, but it is in his heart to destroy and to cut off nations not a few." While thus the King of Assyria was thinking of and intending one thing, God was using him as his instrument to accomplish quite another purpose, and one that he had no thought of and no wish to accomplish.

And it seems to me that our Lord taught the same doctrine, though less distinctly perhaps, when he administered his rebuke to his disciples, who had forbidden some men who were doubtless preaching

Christ, but followed not them.¹ He rebuked them: If they preached Him they could not be *against* Him. Or, as it is in St. Mark "no man that can do a marvelous work (miracle) *in my name*, can lightly speak evil of me." They might be mistaken, and doubtless were so, if they did not follow with the chosen twelve, or acknowledge them to be the Apostles; but they were doing his work, nevertheless, if they were zealous for him. There can be, and there is, no middle ground. "He that is not against us is for us," "and on our part." They were doubtless speaking of Christ, and thus whether what they said of him was true or not, they were directing attention to him, and the matter was too important to be neglected. It concerned the hopes and the salvation of all men; and whoever so learned or heard of him was pretty sure, quite sure if he had the right spirit or any moral earnestness to inquire farther into a matter of such a vital importance to his highest welfare, and thus be put in the way to learn the truth.

There is also a passage in one of the Epistles of St. Paul that seems to me quite significant and instructive on this point. In his Epistle to the Philippians he alluded to some (i, 18) "who preach Christ of envy and strife," as well as to those who preach Christ "of good will and of love." But he adds, "What then? Notwithstanding every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice, yea and will rejoice." In either way Christ was made known to the world, and this was a great thing.

¹ Mark ix, 38, Luke ix, 49.

And if the holy Apostle, could rejoice in the fact that Christ was preached, proclaimed and made known to his fellow men who were perishing in their sins and in their ignorance of the way and means of salvation even though it were by envy and "strife" and with the intent to add "affliction to his bond," we cannot doubt that he could and would much more earnestly rejoice in all the efforts that might be made in good faith, and with the most unquestionable piety and zeal, to make him known who is our only Lord and Saviour, notwithstanding any mistakes in their teachings concerning him, and much ignorance or neglect of the means which he has ordained for the extension and building up of his kingdom.

But then whatever this state of things may be, it is the state of things in which it has pleased Almighty God to assign us our lot and *our work*. Every one must do what he sees and thinks best; and as he sees best; God will overrule it for good and judge him at last "according to the deeds done in the body."

I trust, however, that we may now say, with the concurrence of all persons in our statement, that the day has gone by when it is regarded as an unmixed blessing that there are so many different Churches and Sects, so that each may find a view of religion that will suit himself.

It is a solemn and melancholy fact, that in this nation, the most enlightened and liberal on the face of the earth—where freedom of thought and the right of private judgment are encouraged as they are no where else—where humanity is left to the most unrestrained

liberty of development and progress—the proportion of souls that can be regarded as within the covenanted conditions of salvation, is less than in any other portion of the Christianized world. Yet the fact is undeniably so.

From the very limited means of investigation within my reach, I am inclined to think that there is not more than one in ten of our adult population who make a public profession of Christianity, by a regular observance of the stated ordinances required by the denominations to which they may severally belong. In this estimate I include all denominations, of whatever name or kind; I include all who *call themselves* Christians, and not merely those who would be included by the rule or standard of any one denomination. For myself, I am unwilling to lay down any standard or test by which to decide at present, who will obtain everlasting salvation. If one asks what he shall do to be saved, I, of course, as my duty requires, have a ready answer affirmatively. And if he does not do it, I can tell him that he has not complied with the conditions of salvation and there my duty and my functions end.

We are too apt to forget that salvation is *of grace*, and that the Holy Scriptures were given us—not to be like a book of human statutes which we may interpret as we will and have our interpretation enforced for us *as against the State*. But as against God we have and can have no *rights*. He looketh upon the heart; and when he sees the *disposition* to love and obey, we cannot doubt that he will make large allow-

ance for mistakes in matters of fact and of detail. "To obey is better than sacrifice," in his estimation. Whereas human law must look chiefly at the outward act and see that that is "according to the law." But these laws exist quite as much for the purpose of defining our rights as against the State itself, as for the purpose of prescribing our duties *to the State*, and to our fellow citizens in the State. Hence there are courts and we may go into them and have our rights declared and enforced even as against the State itself. We are not bound to do anything unless "it is so nominated in the bond."

But in the concerns of our spiritual life, it is not a matter of "bond" or of statute between our Saviour and ourselves. We have no *right* and can have none as against him. It is altogether a matter of grace and divine favor. Hence, while we are authorized to say what one *ought* to do to be saved, we have no authority to judge those who choose to neglect some of the obvious duties, because, in their estimation, they are not essential, or are unimportant.

No; the Gospel is not a mere *statute law* for each one to interpret in his favor as far as the laws and nature of language will permit: it is a *message of grace* addressed to those who love the Lord and delight to do his will.

Doubtless reason and conscience are primarily our guide. But we need something higher and more unerring than our reason and conscience, and this want God has supplied by giving us a Revelation of his will.

We have two very instructive cases recorded for us

in the Gospel. The first I have referred to at the beginning of this discussion. This poor, humble, but believing woman, had doubtless done all that she had any means of knowing to be necessary; and she was healed. Or, if we must make an exception, it would be in favor of her modesty and self-distrust. She did not wish to make herself conspicuous—did not, perhaps, even wish to give our Lord so much as the trouble to say a word, that she might be healed. And we can well understand that our Blessed Lord would appreciate such feelings.

The other case is the thief on the cross. This illustrates for us, I think, another great principle of the Divine Economy. There was faith and confession of the utmost unworthiness, and whether he knew of anything more that had been required, we do not know. But we do know that we have here an open public confession and profession of faith in our Lord and of his ability to save. And we know also that there was then no opportunity for him to do anything more. Baptism and the Holy Eucharist were out of the question, and we have the blessed words, "this day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." Nor was there any opportunity for him to recognize the Ministry which our Lord had sent, or to do the other works, meet for repentance and as manifesting the holiness of life that becometh the Saints: and yet we cannot doubt that he was saved.

It is sometimes thought and said that the Ministry at least is not "of the essence of the Church," and even the creeds need not be retained "*in form*, if only

we receive their substance—the truth of the Gospel—as contained and set forth in the Holy Scriptures.” These statements are usually accompanied with, and are an outcome of, the doctrine of the continuity and oneness of the Church from the beginning of human history—the time of the fall of man, to the end of time. The *Church*, it is said, continues, and is one, but there are many *Dispensations*, the one following another, as the Patriarchal, the Mosaic and the Christian; and Christianity is but one of the Dispensations. The Church itself, on this theory, consists of the elect or chosen people, who are in covenant relations with God. Under the Mosaic Dispensation it consisted of all the descendants of Abraham by the line of Isaac and Jacob, who had not omitted circumcision, or neglected the required sacrifices, and the few converts from the Gentiles. Under the Christian Dispensation it consists of all those who have been elected to be received as believers by Holy Baptism, and live in communion and fellowship with those already elected and admitted. But the Ministry and the Worship are changed, more or less, with each new Dispensation; and therefore they cannot be essential—or “of the essence” of the Church.

Now there is a sense of the words in which this is true, and these things are not “of the essence” of the Church. They are not essential to it in the same sense as three sides are essential to a triangle. In this sense probably no one thing is essential except, perhaps, covenant relations with God. The doctrines to be believed have changed, by way of addition at least,

with every succeeding Dispensation. The rites and ceremonies required by the law in each Dispensation, have changed somewhat. And in regard to the Ministry, we have three stages—the patriarchal, in which every man at the head of a family was priest for the family; the Mosaic, in which the office of priesthood was limited to the descendants of Levi; and the Christian, in which it appears to have been limited only to persons properly selected and admitted by ordination, by the laying on of hands.

But our question is not whether these four elements—the Scriptures, the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the Ministry—are essential to the Church, but only whether they are essential to the *Christian Church*, the Church under the Christian Dispensation, the Church of which our Lord spoke when he said “on this Rock I will build My Church.” Doubtless they are not of the essence of the Church, or essential to it in the sense that *God cannot change them*; for he has replaced circumcision by Baptism, animal sacrifices by the Holy Eucharist, the Levitical or Aaronic priesthood by the Christian ministry, “the diverse orders.”¹ In this we concede that these things are not essential in the sense that God cannot change them. But we must still consider whether *we* can change them or have any right to change them. Doubtless he who ordained them can change them. But they were ordained *for us* and *for our use*, and they were destined to extend and last always, even unto the end of the world. Are they not then essential for us if they are not so to him?

¹ I Cor. xii, 28.

Hence if God has appointed persons to make known his will and to teach and guide us in the way of life, it is of the utmost importance that we know who they are and what they proclaim and represent to be his will. Of course they may err and we have "the more sure word of prophecy" to serve as our guide. But if he has "sent them" they are his authorized agents. We must not forget that he has on more than one occasion warned us to be on our guard against those who profess to come in his name but whom he has never sent. His ministers are in some sense "ambassadors for Christ." St. Paul says so,¹ and surely no one who expects favor from a Sovereign will treat his duly appointed ministry with disrespect or neglect.

The abandonment of Sectarianism—and it must be abandoned sooner or later, for a kingdom divided against itself cannot stand—may require much self-denial; in many cases a severe and protracted struggle. But the reader certainly needs not be told that such a struggle may be required by his Saviour. I have the utmost confidence in the good intentions of the vast majority of those whom I believe to be in error. I entertain not the slightest doubt that their salvation may be confidently hoped for through the mercy of the atoning Redeemer. But I do believe that the subject of this book has not been generally presented to their minds and consciences as it admits of being presented, and as it ought to have been. Whether I have done anything towards so desirable an object, is a question which I must leave to others to decide.

¹ 2 Cor. v. 20.

The history of the Church for the early centuries will serve, as I think, as a comment on the doctrines and views of the Church and church unity which I have presented. There were in those early centuries sects of almost all possible varieties and opinions. But where are they now? What has become of them? As sects or denominations they have no name or place of existence in modern times. They disappeared after a few generations, more or less.

As sects or organized bodies, outside of the Church, they have long ago ceased to have a name to live. But if we inquire after their members individually—the people that belonged to them—we find that the great mass of them, or their immediate descendants, returned to the Church. Doubtless there were some of them, of whom it may be said as St. John said of some seceders in his time, “they went out from us because they were not of us.”¹ And they went from worse to worse until they died in their unbelief and without hope. But the most of them returned to the communion of the Church. And if there were any families that had descendants that did not return to the Church, those families became extinct long ago with no line of posterity and no name in existence.

But on the other hand those who became more numerous and continued to exist the longest, gathered in a good many who had never before heard of Christ, and who possibly never could have been reached and converted by the true and lawful ministry of the Church. Nearly all the Goths were at first Arians.

¹ 1 John ii, 19.

And these cases raised the question, then as it does now, as to the conditions of their return and readmission. Some of the Fathers, as St. Cyprian and the African Bishops generally, held that their Baptisms were of no value and ought to be repeated when converts from them came into the Church. But this was not the prevailing view. The view that prevailed was that their Baptisms if duly performed were valid *so far as the outward form* was concerned and that its *spiritual defects*, whatever they may have been were remedied by the "the laying on of hands" in confirmation, whenever they came into the Church.¹

But in regard to their ordinations they were generally held to be of no value. In some cases, however, those who had been ordained by the schismatic Bishops, after their succession, were received on the mere renunciation of their schism.

The leading design of the merciful dispensations of God to man appears to be, to bring back as many as possible, whether from error in religion or viciousness of life, to holiness and submission to his will. In the accomplishment of this work, the Church is the chief visible means and agency. It is the economy of second causes through which God works. On this, so far as we are permitted to judge, depends its whole value. Doubtless it is intrinsically better adapted to that end than any one differently constituted could be. At least it is a matter of faith to think so. But how well soever it may be adapted to the end, the whole tenor of the Scriptures, no less than many ex-

¹ Bingham's Hist. of Lay Baptism, pt. I, chap. I, § xx.

plicit declarations, teach us that membership in it—unless one submits to it, as to the Messenger and Ambassador of Christ, in meekness, humility and love—will be of no avail. “Christ formed within us,” is the grand result at which all its principles, functions and powers are directed. For this an outward organization was given it, and incorporated into the very “foundation that was laid” by Jesus Christ himself, “that there might be no schism in the body;” for this the elements of its constitution, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, were made channels of grace; for this the Holy Ghost was sent to abide with it forever, and for this, charity—which suffereth long and is kind, which envieth not, vaunteth not itself; is not puffed up, which doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not easily provoked, and thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, and never fails—is declared to be “the more excellent way,” and greater than even “faith and hope.”

Seen in this light, the Church is no mere matter of outward form, or combination of forms. It is the living witness and testimony of God—the sheet anchor of religion. And we enter its communion, not because one or more of the peculiarities of its constitution commend themselves to our judgment, or please our fancy, but because we see, as St. Paul says of the Ministry, that unto it, God has committed the work of reconciliation, and by it, as an Ambassador, Christ comes to us, beseeching us that we be reconciled to God. In its communion we may be trained for the

Church and communion above, where schisms and divisions can never prevail, and where we shall see, not as now, through a glass darkly, but face to face, and know even as we are known. Such a view of the subject produces a softening and humiliating effect upon the native hardness of the human heart, and teaches us to renounce our own will, that the will of God may be done; to become nothing in ourselves, that Christ may the more fully dwell within us, and occupy all the faculties of our mind and soul. And if I shall be found to have done anything towards the accomplishment of such a result, I shall feel myself most amply rewarded for the hours of assiduous toil and prayerful thought which I have taken from other labors to bestow on this. That such may be the result, is my prayer to him who overruleth all events, and uses all things as the agents of His Blessed Will.

THE END.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
CALIFORNIA

A4796



A 4796

BR
148
W57
1888

Wilson, William Dexter, 1816-1900.
The church indentified by reference
history of its origin, perpetuation a
extension into the United States. A
ed. New York, James Pott, 1888.
317p. 20cm.

1. Church history. 2. Church of En
History. I. Title.

A4796

CO

